

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 4, 2015

A meeting of the Planning Committee of the County of Kaua'i, State of Hawai'i, was called to order by Mason K. Chock, Chair, at the Council Chambers, 4396 Rice Street, Suite 201, Lihue, Kaua'i, on Wednesday, March 4, 2015, at 1:30 p.m., after which the following members answered the call of the roll:

Honorable Gary L. Hooser
Honorable Ross Kagawa
Honorable Arryl Kaneshiro
Honorable Mason K. Chock
Honorable JoAnn A. Yukimura, Ex-Officio Member
Honorable Mel Rapozo, Ex-Officio Member

Excused: Honorable KipuKai Kualii

Recused: Honorable Arryl Kaneshiro (at 2:01 p.m. to 2:03 p.m.)

Minutes of the February 18, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting.

Upon motion duly made by Councilmember Kagawa, seconded by Councilmember Hooser, and carried by a vote of 4:0:1 (*Councilmember Kaneshiro was not present, Councilmember Kualii was excused*), the Minutes of the February 18, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting was approved.

The Committee proceeded on its agenda item, as follows:

Bill No. 2571	A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEVELOPMENT PLANS, AND FUTURE GROWTH AREAS FOR THE LIHU'E PLANNING DISTRICT (This item was Deferred.)
---------------	--

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Also for the record, Councilmember KipuKai Kualii is excused today. Let me just give you a brief rundown on how I would like to run this first item. As mentioned earlier, we have some consultants here for a presentation. What I would like to do is take care of one (1) piece of business which is an amendment to the actual bill that introduces this plan. It is a bill by request by the Administration. I will have Vice Chair of this Committee, Councilmember Hooser, introduce it and I can add details to it. Then, I would like to ask our consultants to participate in doing the presentation. My estimate is about twenty (20) minutes of a presentation. I am going to ask that we actually hold our questions during that period. The third thing on my expectation would be to take some of the amendments, the small items that I think all of you were presented with, and see if we can get that off the table as well and then come back to and finish with any questions that we need moving forward. Is that acceptable Committee? Thank you. I will hand it over to the amendment from Councilmember Hooser.

Councilmember Hooser moved for approval of Bill No. 2571, seconded by Councilmember Kagawa.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser moved to amend Bill No. 2571 as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto as Attachment 1, seconded by Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Hooser: It has been circulated.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. I can explain. This is again, coming from the Administration. Basically, the request here is that we actually add to Section 3 and separate the words "repeal" and "amend." Section 2 now holds the repeal and Section 3 holds amend. We separated these sections due to process. So, this is a process amendment. The second change is that in the original bill it said "proposed." In Section 10-5.1 under (c) items 1-6. It said "proposed" and if this passes, then it will not proposed. We took that word out of that area. If you have any questions about this we could suspend the rules. If not, we can move on with these amendments. Any questions members, about the actual amendment? No? There is one (1) other thing. We also added the Lihu'e Community Plan to Section 3. It says "and by incorporating by reference the document entitled "Lihu'e Community Plan (2014)." It was just more succinct and provided more direction. No questions? Would anyone like to testify on this amendment before we vote on it?

There being no objections, the rules were suspended to take public testimony.

There being no one present to provide testimony, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

The motion to amend Bill No. 2571 as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto as Attachment 1 was then put, and carried by a vote of 3:0:1:1 (*Councilmember Kaneshiro was recused; Councilmember Kualii was excused*).

Committee Chair Chock: The amendment passes. We are back to the main motion. At this time, I will suspend the rules for our consultants to...oh we have a question. Yes?

Councilmember Kagawa: I just have a question for the Chair or the County Attorney.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Councilmember Kagawa: My concern is that the recusal of Councilmember Kaneshiro puts the Committee at four (4) members and I wanted to know if it was a voluntary recusal or has the Ethics Commission ruled that he should recuse himself.

Committee Chair Chock: Maybe we can ask the County Attorney to explain that recusal. I did not want to get into detail because I did not know the specifics.

Councilmember Kagawa: While the County Attorney comes up and offers his reasoning, I really want to say that I find that if the Ethics Commission did rule on it, I find it hard to fathom why because things in these General Plans does

not give Grove Farm any approvals to proceed. There is still a process that they need to go through, Planning Commission, permitting, and what have you. I do not see why Councilmember Kaneshiro is not allowed to sit on this. It boggles my mind actually.

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

Committee Chair Chock: Mauna Kea.

MAUNA KEA TRASK, County Attorney: Thank you. For the record, Mauna Kea Trask, County Attorney. I was just made aware of these issues. I saw Councilmember Kaneshiro's communication to the Council. I believe he issued a memorandum yesterday regarding his issue. My understanding is that there may be outstanding questions. I am not sure of the underlying rationalization for the Ethics Commission regarding this. I do understand that when this issue came up, Councilmember Kaneshiro was not present. I think he was out-of-State at the time. So, without trying to speculate too much there may be an opportunity to get further clarification to answer some of these questions, for him to appear before the Board to enter into more of a dialogue regarding these matters because I understand it was just a written submittal and because he was not there, there was no opportunity for him to offer further clarification. I do know that when the Board of Ethics does make these advisory opinions or they are requested to, they do engage in a lot of questions. When I submitted mine, I entered into dialogue with them. Without more, I do not want to speculate, but I do think you do bring out very important issues considering ultimately the public elected you all to be here to do a specific job aware of what your individual statuses are. Beyond that, I am not going to speculate further.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you. Good explanation. Thank you, Chair. I am satisfied.

Council Chair Rapozo: I have a question. I am not a Committee member, but in light of what has occurred and I tend to agree with what Councilmember Kagawa has just expressed. I know that Councilmember Kaneshiro is not happy with the result of the Ethics' ruling, but is there an opportunity for this body as a body to challenge the Ethics' ruling? Again as Mr. Kagawa has stated, the vote on this plan does not give any advantage to Councilmember Kaneshiro in any way, shape, or form. Is there an opportunity for the body because Councilmember Kaneshiro is part of the body, that it effects the way we operate and it affects the decision making of this body because he is not here because an independent body feels there is a potential conflict, is there an opportunity for this body...and I do to need the answer right now, but if you could process that and let me know as soon as possible so that we can move in that direction because I want Councilmember Kaneshiro here.

Mr. Trask: I understand that. I would like to, if I can, in researching that, follow-up with a request for an Executive Session to see what your powers, duties, and responsibilities are, and then we can kind of assess that out.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Council Chair Rapozo: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Question Councilmember Yukimura?

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes. When I went before the Ethics Board to ask whether there was a conflict, I was actually pleased to see a written opinion explaining the rationale for their decision. I would imagine that such will be forthcoming on this issue.

Mr. Trask: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: I think we need to try to understand the reasoning of the Ethics Board. They are specifically established for the purpose of determining these ethical issues. At least we should wait for written report.

Mr. Trask: True.

Councilmember Yukimura: I also want to say that by this ordinance before us, this plan gives guidance for how the lands in the Līhu'e area are to be utilized ultimately. Most of the lands are Grove Farm lands. I mean, there is a potential conflict one could argue.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. We will continue to have the discussion. I appreciate you looking into it and we will see the communication from the Board of Ethics. My understanding is Councilmember Kaneshiro has voluntarily recused himself at this point. So, we will come back to this issue and hopefully we can utilize his *mana'o* as we move forward.

Mr. Trask: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. The rules are still suspended, so if I can ask our Planning officials to come forth. *Aloha* and good morning. I know it is going to be very difficult to fit months and months and maybe years of work into twenty (20) minutes, but I am confident that you can move us. I know that all Councilmembers have been briefed and have gone over the plan previously. The floor is yours.

MICHAEL A. DAHILIG, Director of Planning: Thank you Committee Chair Chock and honorable members. Thank you for having us this morning. I do want to introduce besides myself, my lead Planner on this, Lea Kaiaokamalie who has been spearheading this particular plan, and Cheryl Soon with SSFM International, Inc. I also want to recognize Melissa White who has been assisting us as well. I want to just point out a couple of things before I turn the microphones over to them because they are the experts on this plan and I have just been very privileged to actually ride alongside them as they have been engaged in the community on this. You will notice that the bill is a request to amend and adopt the Līhu'e Community Plan and repeal the Līhu'e Development Plan. I want to emphasize the word "development" versus "community" because I think that from the get-go was very symbolic. You will notice the same thing with our South Kaua'i Plan, that Lea and Marie when they started this process two (2) years ago, were very adamant about wanting this process to be community-based versus with the intention of just being a development plan. The process and the perspective of the planners and the consultants have been really about the community and I want to just thank them for their work as they present this to you. I ask for your favorable consideration this morning. I will turn it over to Lea.

LEANORA KAIAOKAMALIE, Long Range Planner: I am just very pleased to be here. Thank you, Councilmembers, for your time. We have come before

you once before you do a workshop. Lea Kaiaokamalie, Long Range Planner with the Planning Department. Sorry. I also just want to again, thank Cheryl and her team at SSFM for moving us through this process. It has been eighteen (18) months. I am very pleased. She mentioned to me earlier and I thought it was a good analogy, better than the one that I was thinking of. This is kind of like a marriage actually. It is scary but it is exciting to us. I have said this before, the original plan was adopted in 1977. This is 2015. So, having what I would like call maybe like an itinerary that is put together by our community for the future really gives not only the Planning Department and the Council in the direction, but also the different agencies that we need to coordinate with for infrastructure and for building our community into the future. I will be turning it over to Cheryl. She will be giving the presentation this morning.

CHERYL SOON, Professional Planner at SSFM International, Inc.: Thank you and good morning. I am Cheryl Soon. I am a professional planner with the company SSFM International, Inc. I too, would like to start by thanking for the honor of being able to work with the community to facilitate the dialogue and to come to the point where we are at. *Mahalo* for that. It has really been a joy. I do not need the full twenty (20) minutes. So, I will move quickly because I know you have a lot that you want to discuss with us as well. Just very quickly, what is a community plan? Basically, it is a policy document. It is meant to guide public and private investment decisions; it links this particular area, this planning area, the Līhu'e District, to the General Plan; it identifies what should be preserved as well as what should be developed or can be developed; but it is not project specific or a site plan. That is a distinction that is important to make sure that we have.

The plan was prepared using multiple levels of community involvement, interaction, and engagement. Starting in July 2013, we started working with an intensive group of individuals who formed what we called the Community Working Group. They held fourteen (14) meetings over the course of the eighteen (18) months. They looked at current conditions, issues, base line data, the vision, revitalization, connectivity, and strategies for growth all in the first six (6) months. Starting in 2014, we started looking at what areas we wanted to remain stable, what areas we would be open to considering for change, we worked on transportation maps, land use maps, and the concept of an urban growth boundary. Towards the latter part of the fall, we started on implementation including discussions on Form-Based Code and being ready for Form-Based Code, and the group reviewed multiple drafts of the plan that you see before you today. In September of 2013, we did a walking audit with Dan Burden. We went into each of the communities and everyone wrote out the type of things that they would like to see changed and the type of things that they would like to see preserved and kept in place. We held multiple community wide meetings. We wanted to make sure that they were fun, we wanted to make sure that children and families were involved, we wanted to make sure that there were multiple ways that people could give their input and their ideas. It started in April 2013 with a kick-off meeting at the Līhu'e Civic Center and we had events, face painting for children, and nine (9) talk story sessions with the different subconsultants working on technical studies. Nine (9) months later, we were ready to go out back into the communities and to do a preview of what looked like was coming together in the plan and what we were going to be focused on. We had special meetings in Puhi, we had special meetings in Hanamā'ulu, and then again, we had an all day workshop in Līhu'e that allowed networking. We were able to present alternatives. We were able to have a considerable amount of debate and discussion about them.

Nine (9) months later in September of 2014, we held the public open house on the draft plan where people were able to comment on various aspects how they felt it had come together and any remaining changes before it started being prepared to go to the Planning Commission. Understanding that everyone is not a meeting goer, we had a website, we had postcards go out into the community to tell them what was happening, we had district wide mailings, we had fliers and posters, radio public service announcements (PSAs), displays at community events, and we even had an Instagram contest associated with the plan.

As part of their kind of roadshow and outreach programs, the Planning Department went out into the community and had a booth talking about both the Līhu'e Plan and the South Kaua'i Plan with different opportunities for people to send in their comments on cards. Bottom line is that the community drove the discussions and the results of this plan. I was also extremely pleased that the County agencies were also actively involved. They essentially are one of the stakeholders of a plan like this. It helps direct some of the priorities that they might put into infrastructures, social programs, housing programs, and the like. They are essentially part of the implementation of this program. They were involved right from the start. It was a real testimony to all of them. They participated. Several of the Department Directors participated in the working group meetings, they participated in the open houses, they reviewed the technical papers that had been prepared, and they reviewed both the administrative draft, the public review draft, and the first draft that went to the Planning Commission. Lea was relentless in going into the agencies and making sure that the statements that we were making were statements that were accurate, that they could understand, and that they could use if the plan were to be adopted.

This slide, I will not go through all of it. It is a line up between what people told us and what the plan does with that information. Starting with the very first one that Līhu'e is and should be the heart of the island. The plan talks about how to revitalize the town core to make that happen, how to make Rice Street into a Festival Street, how to revitalize the district using economic development including arts and technology. We looked at making sure that we retain the historic buildings and their features, that we found more and more ways to encourage walking and biking, and ensuring that the infrastructure that was put in place in this district is supportive of the vision.

What you have before you today and believe me, it is very gratifying for us to be at this point, is the proposed Līhu'e Community Plan update. It has six (6) chapters. Very quickly, what is the same? The last plan being adopted in 1976 and the current plan 2014-2015, I guess, will become the new date. First, the vision for Kaua'i remains very solidly similar that is the heart of the entire island. It is where the government center is, it is where the economic center is, it is the transportation center, it is the social center, it is the gathering place, and it remains not a totally distribute island, but Līhu'e remains as a core gathering place. Having said that, the vision still is to preserve rural character, to have distinct and unique communities, to have a vibrant town core center and civic center, to have a continued emphasis on historic preservation, and to celebrate the natural beauty. The district boundaries remain the same. They are essentially the judicial districts and we have not changed the boundaries that were in the 1976 plan.

But what is different since the last plan? Well, quite a bit frankly. We updated technical studies on demographics, land use, employment, and transportation in order to reflect the General Plan that had been passed in the year 2000 and to reflect

the Kaua'i Multimodal Transportation Plan. We also have converted it into what I believe is a much more user-friendly version of the document with more pictures and illustrations of the concepts being discussed.

There were some things that are new. Certainly, the incorporation of principles of smart growth and sustainability, while certainly not new to this island, you are already winning awards such as this morning. It really was not reflected in the 1976 plan so it is now. We have identified areas of change that would be both sustainable and compact. There is the transportation focus on multimodal which was really not in the 1976 document. We have prepared this plan to conform to any future direction that the Council may give for Form-Based Code, we have included addressing climate change adaptation into the plan, and we have sections on workforce housing.

If we briefly look at some of the numbers that drove the story that is contained in the plan, Līhu'e district in 1990 had approximately eleven thousand (11,000) residents. Right now today, it is on its way to being eighteen thousand (18,000). We are just shy of eighteen thousand (18,000). The projections are expected to be approximately twenty thousand (20,000) in about twenty (20) years, so by the target year of this plan, 2035. This is the fastest growing district on the island and it is growing at nearly twice the island average.

If we look at the population changes for each of the districts from 1990 including both what has occurred and what is projected to occur, Līhu'e is in the red line which is just below that. The top line is at Kapa'a, the blue line. The line just below that, the green line, is South Kaua'i. The other four (4) are very close to flat lining, but you see that the shape of the curve for the red line is most dramatic in the Līhu'e district. That is partly policy driven that because of the services available in this district, it is the best location for locating increased housing opportunities.

If we drill down from population to housing, the housing stock in 2010 was approximately five thousand three hundred (5,300). We are projecting a need of nine thousand nine hundred (9,900) units, a difference of close to almost ninety percent (90%). Sixty percent (60%) of that current housing stock is coming up in the categories for one hundred eighty percent (180%) of median income. So, we are getting a mismatch and the next slide will show that. We are getting a mismatch between what we need and what we are getting. Sorry, it is two (2) slides down. I am going to divert for just a second. The components of your population change on Kaua'i are primarily coming from births as you see on the left side and less so from different categories of migration. The growth is coming from on-island folks.

You are also an aging population. This has important implications for housing type and size as well as the need for services including transportation. More and more rather than being in an isolated location, it is important for seniors to have access to services, ideally even in a walking mode or at least in a short transit ride mode. At certain ages they are no longer able to drive themselves around. As I started to mention earlier, there is a growing disparity between the income levels, affordability, what actually gets built. This is a problem island wide. It becomes acute in Līhu'e where half the population growth is targeted. There is a need to bring to bring together housing policies, land use policies, and transportation policies.

Anticipating the need for new housing what the community examines strategies for that growth and we quickly agreed that we wanted to be sure to follow smart growth principles, that there would be a range of housing types; that they exist

in walkable neighborhoods; that they be distinctive and attractive; that they have an amount of community cohesion and collaboration that can take place from the closer proximities; that it be predictable, fair, and cost effective for the developers to develop these lands; that there be mixed land uses, not single focused land uses; this also has the complimentary opportunity of them preserving open spaces, farm land, natural areas, and critical environmental areas; that there will be a variety of choices for transportation; that the development be directed towards existing communities; and that there be compact building design. These are the principles that we injected into that plan.

Councilmember Yukimura: I have a question.

Committee Chair Chock: We will make an exception. Go ahead.

Councilmember Yukimura: Can you just tell us what the purple lines mean?

Ms. Soon: Yes. The difference between the green and purple is the purple are extensions of existing built areas and the green are new areas that could develop that are within walking distance but not immediately touching.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Soon: We were not only interested of course in residential growth. We also looked at industrial and commercial as well as agricultural and open space needs. Again, it was a full district plan, not just the development portions of it. We looked at a number of important new tools to help achieve the multiple objectives of this plan for growth and preservation, and perhaps the most significant of these is what we are calling the "Urban Edge Boundary (UEB)" which is meant to literally be that the development areas of change remain inside the boundary and areas outside remain in agriculture, open space, or other purposes than for development. In addressing all of these issues, we also made there that the Līhu'e Community Plan provides specific policies that would ensure the unique and distinct communities within each of the areas as shown here. While the largest of course is Līhu'e and the Līhu'e Town Core, there is also Puhi, Hanamā'ulu, and then areas such as Kalepa, Kapaia, Kīpū Kai, Nuhou, Puali, Kīpū, and Nāwiliwili.

A little bit of what happens next. Should you approve the Līhu'e Community Plan with any amendments, the ordinance sets the plan into law and then there is a series of implementation steps that would be needed to bring other areas of the land used system into conformity. We looked towards some of the features of implementation being there are some sections of the General Plan that would need to be updated to be consistent, the Land Use Map in particular. Some amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 10 in order to create special planning areas and to define the requirements for proposals that would take place in mixed use special planning areas. There would be some State land use amendments applying the land use designation to urban from the current designations in the Isenberg *mauka* area, Hanamā'ulu *mauka*, Puhi *mauka*, and South Puhi. So, four (4) areas. There would need to be Zoning Map amendments and then the other side of implementation of course, is the capital program and insuring that infrastructure water, sewer, roads, and the like are consistent with the plan and treating these areas with some degree of priority. That does complete my presentation. I know there are some questions on Transient Vacation Rentals (TVRs) and I think it may be best if

you just raise it at that time. TVR was mentioned in our plan so I just wanted to raise that one. I know that one was asked in the last couple days.

In closing, our plan honors the memories of Peter Nakamura who really guided us through much of the work and was really a treasured friend of all of ours, and then two (2) members of our community working group who are no longer with us, Cheryl Lovell Obatake and Mattie Yoshioka. So, we just dedicate the plan in their memories.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Ms. Soon: That completes my presentation.

(Councilmember Kagawa was noted as not present.)

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you for the presentation. Again, I asked Councilmembers to hold their questions because what I would like to do is actually introduce the amendments for the plan itself that were discussed. I believe our hope is to take action on those which are mostly typographical errors (typos) some word changes. I did have a few questions, but what I wanted to do is get a sense from members about their comfort level with the amendments that were introduced ahead of time. I think you have been briefed on them. If there are many questions, then we can start to vet that.

Council Chair Rapozo: Mr. Chock, I was just going to raise the point that you need to have a quorum here.

Committee Chair Chock: Oh, okay we are going to have to take a recess until Councilmember Kagawa comes right back. Thank you.

There being no objections, the Committee recessed at 10:27 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:30 a.m., and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: Welcome back. We are back from our recess. Thank you. Again, I am just trying to get a feel from Councilmembers in terms of their comfort level with the proposed small amendments that are on the floor right now, and ask to approve the amendment. I think I checked with everyone else, but Councilmember Hooser, how are you feeling?

Councilmember Hooser: I have been thoroughly briefed and I am comfortable with the amendments.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. That being said, what will do now is I am actually going to ask for public testimony on the presentation and anything else that has come up. We will come back and vote on this amendment and then we will ask for questions and answers for the whole thing. Yes?

Councilmember Hooser: So, there is a second amendment. Would you like me to introduce that second one?

Committee Chair Chock: Yes, why do we not do that now?

Councilmember Hooser: Okay.

Committee Chair Chock: And then we will take public testimony.
Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser moved to amend Bill No. 2571 as amended as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto and incorporated here in as Attachment 2, seconded by Councilmember Kagawa.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, thank you. We have had that discussion already on where we are with it. We will suspend the rules further for public testimony. Anyone would like to testify on this item? Mr. Bernabe, come up.

Councilmember Kagawa: Should we not vote?

Council Chair Rapozo: Are they testifying on the bill or the amendment?

Councilmember Kagawa: We should vote on the amendment.

Committee Chair Chock: Amendment.

There being no objections, the rules were suspended to take public testimony.

MATT BERNABE: Matt Bernabe.

Committee Chair Chock: Hold on, Matt. Just for clarification, we have already voted on the amendment for the bill. You can speak on the plan, the presentation of the plan. We have not voted on that yet, and any of the amendments that have just been introduced. Go ahead.

Mr. Bernabe: Matt Bernabe. Well, I just want to point out that I personally disagree with centralizing everything in Līhu'e. In the olden days they had court in Hanalei, Kapa'a Library, and Līhu'e. So, even that was not centralized. I do agree that a new Safeway, some more houses, and all of that. I am not opposing anything like that whatsoever. They need more nightlife over here. Rob's Good Times Grill cannot be the only thing. Restaurants, let us go with some restaurants. Anyway, I do disagree with the whole premise that we need to centralize Līhu'e. Her own graph shows that she is right under Kapa'a and Kapa'a is not flat lined. Why are we not projecting more growth in those flat lined lower communities where they are traveling to Līhu'e and Kapa'a for the jobs, rights, and let them have more growth out there. Let us not put all of our eggs in one (1) basket. They did that at Pearl Harbor and look what happened, right? They put all the planes lined up and they got blown up. We need to diversify the communities a little bit better, although I do agree more restaurants and more houses would work.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Matt, I just wanted to get more clarity in your testimony. What specifically do you think should or should not be?

Mr. Bernabe: Well, just the idea that everything should be centralized.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Mr. Bernabe: Look, we are finally get another Safeway out here. Thank God because I see more locals at Times at Kukui Grove than I do Kapa'a.

So, there are tourist from Po'ipū traveling to Safeway. I mean, if you folks ever go in Safeway, it looks like the mainland. There are a lot of people in there that are visitors. They love Safeway. You go to Big Save, you go to Times, I know more people in Līhu'e Times than I do my own Kapa'a Safeway. So, that is an example of yes, I support that. Put that out there. Just the premise of let us get everything back into Līhu'e, I mean, just centralizing the police station. Now everybody has to travel to Līhu'e just to go deal with court whereas when I was a kid and you folks were kids, if you lived in the North Shore, you went to Hanalei. I believe it was the post office or something.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Mr. Bernabe: I am not saying that is where we should be still holding court, but I am saying why did we not spend so much money on this multiplex that is not even utilized completely? We did not put a nice substation out there for some court, right? So, people did not have to traverse. We do not have the biggest roads.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Mr. Bernabe: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Would anyone else like to testify on this item?
Mr. Rosa.

JOE ROSA: Good morning. For the record, Jose Rosa. For one thing, I have been a resident of Līhu'e for the past eighty (80) plus years. Now, I have lived through many General Plans of Līhu'e when Līhu'e was owned by Amfac Properties. Līhu'e Shopping Center in 1960 developed into what it was and now it is a County seat. The plans for Līhu'e which was owned by Amfac Properties, they have had plans and it has been consistent to what they had started from what I could remember when I was in high school that any development as far as businesses and industry would be down of Kūhiō Highway to the shore of Ahukini and Nāwiliwili basically because of the airport and the two (2) ports at Ahukini and Nāwiliwili. They said that would be the ideal area for business and like industry. I think it was something that was well planned by Amfac Properties. Now, when A&B Properties came in and took over from Amfac Properties, they came in and I noted that they were land developers. I said, "Oh, they are going to eat up all of the plantation land. They are going to develop all of the lands. They are going into tourism, hotels, you name it." Amfac Properties started in the hotel industry when they purchased Coco Palms. That is why we have some of the problems over there in that area and they were also developing the Waiohai property. That goes back as the history. In Līhu'e here, the area *mauka* of Kūhiō Highway all the way up to Kilohana Slopes was supposed to plan for residential housing so that the people could patronize the businesses in the Līhu'e area, in the shopping centers, or whatever it is. It was planned. After this County took over and started to do planning, they tried to finagle everything around and we started to have a lot of spot zoning. I think the plantations were on target with their sections the way they had it, below Kūhiō Highway to the ocean, Ahukini and Nāwiliwili. Business like industry. *Mauka* of the highway, residential. That is the start of it. That is why I can tell you that the houses on Umi Street are supposed to be the last housing that Amfac Properties had planned until A&B Properties came in, they took over, and they developed the rest down to the stadium. Those are the kinds of issues that are going to come up. People are going to start grumbling, "Hey..."

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you, Mr. Rosa.

Mr. Rosa: "...we have to stop the football game because it is too much noise."

Committee Chair Chock: Mr. Rosa, that is your time. Thank you.

Mr. Rosa: Well, I do not think anybody else is going to be speaking about it.

Committee Chair Chock: It does not matter. I need to stop you. Your three (3) minutes are done.

Mr. Rosa: Like I just said, if I have a chance, I will come back. These people the County is turning plans now...

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, Mr. Rosa.

Mr. Rosa: ...they are going to...

Committee Chair Chock: Let me check. You can have another three (3) minutes if no one else wants to testify, okay? Let us clear the seat. Oh, I see Bev Brody wants to come up and speak. Please come up. Thank you, Mr. Rosa.

BEV BRODY: Bev Brody.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Ms. Brody: I would like to voice my complete support for this plan. I think that one of the slides that was particularly interesting that even Ross mentioned earlier was the fact that our population is going to get older. You said there are people ninety (90) years old driving. Well, hopefully not sometimes. There is going to be a time when they are not going to be able to drive, but in order to have independence they need to be able to get around places. So, this plan clearly shows alternative transportation. It is the cutting edge of smart growth principles. It is everything that we have talked about earlier about creating a healthier community through active transportation and smart growth principles. I highly support it. I think that the team has done an outstanding job and I urge you to accept this plan.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Ms. Brody: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Anyone else would like to testify? Seeing none, anyone would like to testify...oh. Here we go. Ken. Mr. Taylor, please come forward. Are you going to testify? Come.

KEN TAYLOR: Chair and members of the Council, my name is Ken Taylor. First of all, I would like to say I cannot comment on the amendments to this because we were not given any copies of it.

Committee Chair Chock: Would you like one? Yes. Can we get some copies to the members of the public?

Mr. Taylor: Anyway, the plan itself, I do not have a problem with. What I do have a problem with is again, moving forward with approving development without having infrastructure in place. We also heard about the plan addressing smart growth and sustainability. We hear a lot toady about smart growth as though smart growth was a magic key to achieving sustainability. A central ingredient in smart growth is regional planning. Regional planning encourages more population growth and population growth is unsustainable. It is thus clear that smart growth cannot solve the problems. Smart growth destroys the environment. Dumb growth destroys the environment. The only difference is it that smart growth destroys the environment with good taste. That in itself is a worthwhile goal, but one that still destroys the environment. It is like booking passage on the Titanic. If you are dumb, you go steerage. If you are smart, you go first class, but either way, the results are the same. Smart growth is a means of making unsustainability as pleasant as possible. We need to start realizing it. I mean, you go back and look at some of the community plans that were done in the 1970s. They called for all kinds of infrastructure activity. The development took place, but the infrastructure did not. That is why I am concerned today again, about moving forward with approval of development without first getting the infrastructure in place. I hear from time to time that well, smart growth, people are going to walk, they are going to take the bus, or they are going to ride their bicycle. That is fine, but even if you take twenty-five percent (25%) or thirty percent (30%) of new development and put them on the bike or the bus or walking, there will be...

Committee Chair Chock: Alright, that is your three (3) minutes. Hold on. Does anyone else want to testify? Okay, we are going to have to vacate the seat for...oh, we have a question first. Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Ken, would you not agree that smart growth makes more efficient use of infrastructure?

Mr. Taylor: I am sorry.

Councilmember Yukimura: Would you not agree the smart growth makes more efficient use of infrastructure?

Mr. Taylor: Well, there is no question about it, but population...

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you.

Mr. Taylor: You save twenty percent (20%) or thirty percent (30%), but increase by seventy percent (70%). You are still creating a problem if you do not put the infrastructure in place.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for answering.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Kamuela.

KAMUELA COBB-ADAMS, Housing Director: Good morning. Kamuela Cobb-Adams, Housing Director. I was a participant in this Līhu'e Plan. The first comment I wanted to say was it really was a diverse group of people. We had Councilmembers and we have had Department Heads, like they said in the presentation. We had community members and business members. I wanted to first say that was great, not just that we got different perspectives, but I think it was great for me and everyone there to learn from each other, the different perspectives that came about. I think this plan realizes a whole bunch of different opinions. I do not think everyone in the conversation said this is exactly how I want it, but this was exactly how all of us kind of came to it. It was like a culmination of a lot of different opinions. So, I thought that was huge. I just wanted you folks to know that I did not go to every single meeting, but I went to a bunch of them and it was great discussion, very respectful, and many different opinions. So, I would like to say that the Planning Department and the consultants did a great job at getting a lot of different opinions and putting it into something that is usable. Secondly, I think planning is always needed. I think the culmination of this plan is that. It is a plan. We need this plan so we can plan what type of infrastructure is needed and where. We might not have the infrastructure all set for this now, but you need a plan so you can plan the infrastructure that needs to support these type of developments. I think this plan is awesome. Like I said, it is not perfect, but it is awesome. It is a start and a plan is just a plan. The next step is how do we utilize this plan. We need this type of plan to solve not all of Kaua'i's problems, but to help Līhu'e and I think we need a plan for all of the different areas on the island. I think that is what we are going to do. This is just one (1) of many plans to come. I think housing, obviously, needs to be taken into consideration. I think this plan has taken that into it. I disagree that the plan does not grow the population. The data already shows the population is growing and most of it is from births. We need to plan for those births and for those people to live here otherwise they will move on. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Question.

Councilmember Yukimura: Kamuela, I am so glad you spoke and participated. As Housing Director, do you feel that this plan is sufficient to assure affordable housing in Līhu'e?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: I do not think it would assure it. It is a plan. The assurance is going to be in us carrying out the plan, but I think it is a good plan to provide opportunity for affordable housing, yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: But you think that we have everything we need in this plan that should be in a plan for affordable housing?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: That is a hard question to answer. Like I said, I think it accomplishes a lot of different perspectives. If it was a perfect plan for affordable housing, it would not be perfect for business or it would not be perfect for some other entity. I think it is a perfect middle ground for all of the entities who came to the table who realized the plan. That is my answer.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Council Chair.

Council Chair Rapozo: I am not a Committee member. I will ask the question in another way. Does this plan prohibit us from moving forward with affordable housing projects?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: No. I think it supports it.

Council Chair Rapozo: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Vice Chair.

Councilmember Kagawa: Kamuela, what plan are we following now? Are we following the old General Plan? What were we following prior to this plan right here?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: Well, I know there is the old General Plan and there is also...

Councilmember Kagawa: And that was what year?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: I could not...2000.

Councilmember Kagawa: 2000? So, fifteen (15) years later we are improving that old plan. This is very important because we have much newer information and much newer needs. That is why it is very important to have this updated plan, right?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: Yes, it is based on new data like the population is eighteen thousand (18,000) versus eleven thousand (11,000), I think was in the past.

Councilmember Kagawa: I guess the last thing, would it be possible if you can maybe share what you shared with us to Paula at the Boards & Commissions so she can relay to the Ethics Commission just what you said, what this group did, what it is made up of, and what its purpose is because I think it would be helpful for the Ethics Commission to hear that? It sounds like the Ethics Commission may feel like this is some kind of approval given to the big landowners and it is far from it based on your testimony. It is a plan that may happen, may not happen, we want to follow it, but it is not set in stone or it is not giving anybody the rights to do anything and it is not limiting us to do anything, right?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: Yes, to a certain degree.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Clarifying question.

Councilmember Yukimura: The gap, and you have shown it yourself, the map that shows the mismatch between affordability and the supply, how is this plan going to address that or are there ways that this plan can address that?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: My belief in addressing the gap is we as government cannot just put the burden on any new developer to solve all of the problems because if you do that, the new developer will come in and in order to maintain profit, would have to sell to the highest possible person.

Councilmember Yukimura: I agree.

Mr. Cobb-Adams: I think this plan provides us guidance of the different government entities to provide the appropriate infrastructure to support the types of projects that we want such as higher density projects that we can build at a price that would be affordable price to the gap groups or the locals or *kama'āina*.

Councilmember Yukimura: But where a single family house can sell in Līhu'e for six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000) and maybe an apartment for less, how is giving infrastructure going to solve the problem of the price of housing in Līhu'e such that most people who need it here, our local population that is growing and being born, going to be able to afford it?

Mr. Cobb-Adams: Well, I think the plan creates a framework for us to provide the infrastructure to the projects that would provide that kind of product.

Councilmember Yukimura: But if they are not market restricted they can sell into the market and they will sell for more.

Mr. Cobb-Adams: I agree, but I do not think the plan goes down to that detail. Those are things we are going to have to work out. The plan is just a framework for us to plan for that.

Councilmember Yukimura: So, without those details though, we could have a lot of growth, four thousand (4,000) more units, and they would all be selling at a price that most of our families cannot afford.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Councilmember Yukimura: I am just asking how we are going to do it. If you look at the history of Līhu'e and why we have all of that housing in Puhi, it was because of the sixty percent (60%) housing requirement that the Land Use Commission imposed on Grove Farm and it was onerous, but it did provide the housing for this generation. The question is how are we going to provide housing for the next?

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. I want to bring us back to where we are, which is public testimony. We are going to have more time for the specific questions that are forthcoming. Anyone would like to testify who has not?

GLENN MICKENS: For the record, Glenn Mickens. Thank you, Mason. The two (2) previous speakers for me, have hit the nail right on the head. We are going to have to put our infrastructure in place before we keep on having whatever master plan you are talking about, 1976 when the General Plan was started. That is forty (40) years ago, thirty-nine (39) years ago. It is not working. Whatever the mast plan is, it is not the way to go. We have horrendous traffic out there. The only way you are going to solve that is not letting the Planning Department just rubber stamp every project that comes before them. The Planning Department had to have seen or they should have seen the problems that were going to be created if they are going to give somebody permits to go ahead and build things. Put the infrastructure first and now let them go ahead and build. To let them go ahead and build it, we are doing it backwards. Anyway, to me, again just as the previous two (2) speakers have said, it is infrastructure. There is no doubt about that. Thank you, Mason.

Committee Chair Chock:
Second time. Mr. Rosa.

Thank you. Anyone else would like to testify?

Mr. Rosa: Again, for the record, Joe Rosa. As I said, I have been around. JoAnn, you were six (6) years old in 1952 or so. That was when the United States of America said the nation will grow by way of the highways. That is when all of the continental highways in the United States were taking progress coming in from the East Coast. I was there in 1952. I have seen the Pennsylvania – New Jersey turnpike and I have seen the Pennsylvania – Ohio turnpike being constructed when I was in the service there. Later on, I seen the reality when it was reaching out in the West Coast already. So, our nation is built around highways and the highways are here to stay because you can see it in the United States of America, all of those transcontinental highways. First things first in 1950 when I started working, and Carol Soong was with Department of Transportation (DOT) later on when I was about ready to retire. The infrastructure for this island was planned by the late Robin Belt and Collins people. He was the District Engineer on Kaua'i. They had the *mauka* and Kapule Highway planned as part of the infrastructure for Līhu'e. Kapule Highway took thirty-six (36) years to build because I started in 1950, my first day of work was on Kapule Highway when the Marriott entrance is. I also worked on the *mauka* side. I knew that it started from by way pass Kīpū Road going back in between of Kaua'i Community College (KCC) and Island School pass the Kilohana Carriage House there, and came out back here in Līhu'e about a mile from Kūhiō Highway. It was taken all the way to Wailua Homesteads and down pass to Anahola. I know the infrastructure was planned, but they make plans but it does not materialized. Basically, the Council does not work with the State Highways Division nowadays. I do not know if Carol Soong was aware when she was at DOT that the State took away each island's planning of their own highways. So, that is when I saw everything started go downhill here on Kaua'i with our highway construction that we still use the highway from Kapa'a to Līhu'e which has been in existence for eighty-two (82) years. Where else can you see on this island that still has a one (1) way in and one (1) way out for eighty-two (82) plus years? Coming from the West Side for seventy-eight (78) years based on Kapaia Bridge built 1932. The Old Līhu'e Mill Bridge, 1936. That is the kind of highway system that we have. We do not have the infrastructure that would move this island forward because Kapule Highway...

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you, Mr. Rosa.

Mr. Rosa: ...and the *mauka* ulterior, we put great roads that come into the city here.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Mr. Rosa: And Amfac were the developers of the Līhu'e town area. I think what they are doing is to come people's wishes. That is about it.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Rosa: It is not what the tourist like to see.

Committee Chair Chock: I have to stop you.

Mr. Rosa: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you for the history and perspective. I appreciate it. Mr. Bernabe. Second try.

Mr. Bernabe: Matt Bernabe for the record. I would just like to reiterate that I am for some growth in Līhu'e and I do not even know the plan. I am just against centralizing every aspect of Kaua'i's life in Līhu'e. As I was sitting here listening to the conversations it dawned on me. Are we talking about providing this infrastructure and then the people come in and build? I am led to believe that the bargaining table is they are supposed to fund some of the infrastructure. Is that not how it really works? The other thing that I would want to say is I did not think it was pertained to this subject, but after listening to testimony, I think it is exactly on the money. It has to do with the old ditch system. If this plan had any inkling to identify dry creeks or reestablish the flumes so that we do not have a Koloko Dam episode again. I mean, this is a reality on Kaua'i. We get weeks and weeks of ten (10) inch plus rains and people develop on old drought lines just like they did on the North Shore and then later down the line, we pay the price in civil liberties by lawsuits and whatnot. I think Kaua'i really, if they are going to the Planning Department, Līhu'e is a very centralized old system. It has a big block of the old flumes and reservoirs in it. So, this is right on the money for Līhu'e Planning Department. Why is there never a discussion about reestablishing these waterways so we can get some farming involved and not worry about drilling so much? I mean, this is crucial to sustainability and nobody is talking about it. I do not understand what the problem is. That is all I have to say.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Anyone would like to testify a second time? Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Chair and members of the Council, my name is Ken Taylor. Again, I will say I have no problem with the plan per say as long as we get the infrastructure in place before development starts. I want to read page 2 on this amendment issue. This discussion about the Rice Camp, when it talks about walking opportunities within the project and to retail commercial establishments on Rice Street. Where are the people going to go? Are they going to walk over and buy a new car? Are they going to go to the pub? There is no place to go shopping for groceries. A few restaurants and a coffee shop. This is the kind of problem that you folks and the County Administration elected to get rid of the grocery store that was servicing this whole Līhu'e core area. This plan does not seem fit to put that back in place and it is unfortunate because if Rice Camp is an example of the new so-called smart growth projects, then we have a serious problem. Small businesses do not exist when there is not enough people to make them viable. I do not see the density in any of these proposed areas that would make any retail establishment viable. Again, I want to say even if you were able to get thirty percent (30%), forty percent (40%) of the people in these new projects out of their cars and onto the bike, onto the bus, or walking that is still sixty percent (60%) of those people using vehicles adding to the existing problem. It is not just a problem in this development area. It is the cumulative problem from the whole island. We know there is a problem out there and we need to address it. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Any more testimony? Come up.

PAT GRIFFIN: Committee Chair, Council Chair, and Councilmembers, my name is Pat Griffin. I am privileged to serve as the President of the Līhu'e Business Association (LBA). The LBA enthusiastically supports this plan. I want to first compliment both SSFM International, Inc. and Cheryl personally

as well as our County Planning Department. They did a fine job all the way through and we have a plan to testify to that. Basically, the plan talks about how we can build a community where people can live, work, and play. It starts with the ideals of such a community. It talks about the land and its people now, predictions for the future, and then goes on to talking about what it will take to meet those predictions, the best places to cluster residences, and create an efficiency of scale so all of that infrastructure can work efficiently. It is the County's job with develops to make sure that growth provides room for both the prosperous and the struggling. That is not part of the plan per say, but the policy that sets that stage for how to do that. It is important and we talked about it a lot in the community working group that we not consign those who can least afford it to outlying areas where both transportation and time costs more than it does for people who live closer to those goods and services. I know there is a lot of jargon about smart growth, Form-Based Code, and transects, but in the end, it is all about where we think we can go as a community to assure prosperous future. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Alright, anyone else? If not, I am going to actually ask our planner to come back up just for a minute. I do have a question on one (1) amendment. I will entertain at this point, any other questions on the amendments, we will call the meeting back to order for further discussion, and vote on that if possible. It could be answered real quickly. I know we went through this, but when I look at the last amendment and this might be applied to page 119 as well. Page 123 which is the comfort stations at Lydgate Park campsite. Can you remind me or tell me why that was taken out?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Thank you, Chair. This project was one that is no longer in the Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) list. So, confirmation was made with Keith Suga on that regard. It is by the purview of the Council to add back projects if you so wish as well. We wanted to reflect that current list and in doing so, we were asking to remove it.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. It might be a question for Parks particularly why they are taking it out of CIP. I am just assuming that this is a need as it was originally here.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: It was a need that was identified in the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. I guess since that plan has come about, there have been other projects that have become a priority. In talking with them, that was the response that they gave us as well and we just wanted to reflect, again, what the agency's priorities were.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you so much. That is all the questions I have. Any questions about the amendments Councilmembers?

Council Chair Rapozo: I have one (1).

Committee Chair Chock: Ok.

Council Chair Rapozo: I bring it out just because I know I met with Lea yesterday, but I think it is important in addition to what you had just asked. The bathrooms at Lydgate were something that I believe was promised to the community. When we came up with all of the plans to build this soccer field and all of the things that we were going to do for the community and we would be able to use this for football and soccer. Part of that was restrooms. It is disturbing to see that removed.

You are right, it is the prerogative of this body to put it back in and Parks will have to answer to that during the budget because I think that is totally inappropriate to remove those projects from what I believe the community was assured. So, that is disturbing. The other one which is regarding the landfill. Interestingly, they removed...this would be on page 70. Replace the section on Solid Waste capacity as follows. They are removing the statement "The existing Kekaha Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF) is projected to reach capacity in 2014." Now, why was that removed? It is the truth. That should not be removed. I do not vote on this today because I am not in the Committee, but I can tell you I am not going to support the removal of that. I am hoping that the Committee today will not support that and I would ask, Mr. Chair, that you take this in seriatim so some of these things can be further amended. The addition was that the Administration is seeking lateral expansion on Kekaha Landfill. This is the addition. It says, "...the addition of a lateral cell 2 at the existing MSWLF" That is a proposal. There is no guarantee that will happen. I mean, there is still a ton of work to be done to get to that lateral. I think when we are doing a plan, I think that we need to be real. I am not sure why that was even taken out and I am not sure if you answer. The lateral is no guarantee. The fact of the matter is that the Kekaha Landfill capacity is real. It is a date that is not an opinion. It is a date that is done by statistics. To remove that, I think would be really misleading to the public who reads this plan. That is the fact of the matter and I want that in there so the public understands that we are at a crisis, a crisis we have been in for ten (10) years. Why remove it? I am not sure. I would ask the Committee to seriously consider leaving that language in and making it clear that the proposal for a lateral expansion is simply that, that is subject to approval that may not occur. It may, it probably will, but there is no guarantee. I think the plan needs to be reflective of that. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you, Chair. Did you want to respond to it?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Only that it was a rewrite. It was not actually a removal of the sentence itself. The agency just requested basically, a rewrite of the sentence. Your comments are taken, Chair.

Council Chair Rapozo: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Let us get to the other questions to and then we can decide on how we want to do this. Go ahead Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Number 16, regarding economic development, I appreciate the addition of the art center, but it should be a plural rather than a singular. Arts center. I do want to acknowledge that it was out of the planning process that this particular project was conceived and I was so excited that day...yes, Lisa, thank you, and Cheryl, that there was that kind of community thought and planning. While this is still in its conceptualization so it could evolve just like the digital technology center has now become a creative technology center. It will evolve. I wanted a space holder in there for it because I believe things will be coming forth in that arena which is very befitting of the vision for Lihue.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser: Just a little bit more clarity and I apologize if you addressed this already, with regard to the Solid Waste because when I first looked at the deletion it made sense to me because it is now 2015. If it was capacity it would

be done it seems like and that is why we are deleting it. If you could explain. Is that why it is being deleted?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Well, as the draft went around to the various agencies, the solid waste section was one of those that was under review. I guess the request did not come in quick enough, I saw it a little later, to revise the sentencing so that it would make a little bit more sense on what is going to happen with solid waste in the future. We just honored that and added it to our matrix because it was after the fact.

Councilmember Hooser: The deletion of that sentence is what I am talking about. "The existing Kekaha Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF) is projected to reach capacity..." Maybe you can say "was projected." I mean, this is just out of context in terms of the calendar. I suppose you could say "was" expected. It would be in accurate statement.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Right. It would.

Councilmember Hooser: It might satisfy...

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: "Was" would be fitting.

Councilmember Hooser: Just a suggestion.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Yes.

Councilmember Hooser: Because otherwise it does not seem to make sense to me. Thank you.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Any further questions?
Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: I think for me I kind of agree with Councilmember Hooser. We can change it to "was" since "is" would not make sense. I actually have no problem deleting it because this plan is giving a little history, it is not conveying something that would make us liable for slander or anything, right?

Mr. Dahilig: I think that is one of the, as you characterized Councilmember Kagawa, that this...excuse me. My voice is a bit hoarse. These plans are a snapshot at any given time. Like anything the community evolves and perspectives evolves. Things like the selfie five (5) years from now probably will not be in. We may have different phones. So, things change. We take that in mind when we draft these things because we want to memorialize the perspectives at the time. It is in a sense a bit of a community diary as well as a community plan. Like anything, other agencies are making decisions and other community members are bringing different ideas to the table. This is a moving target in a sense. I want to say that. Like anything, our theory behind this is to try to provide something as flexible as possible so that when the community wants to move forward on implementing some of these ideas, that it suits their needs at the time but also provides enough postmarks and we proposed benchmarks and guidance down the line to actually remain consistent with the overall intent. Something like this would be somewhat of a

memorialization of what that agency is thinking at any given time, just to answer your question.

Councilmember Kagawa: I mean, I appreciate the language after because I think that explains why we are taking it out. We are saying what we were in the process of doing. We are not saying that we have the approvals of anything.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Right. It was not a matter of saying something that was not true, but the way that it read before I think put a lot of people in the community to a radar because it was 2014 at that point. The wording was expected, that would work as well to convey what the status of our solid waste facility is.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you.

Council Chair Rapozo: I have a follow-up. What is the projected capacity? What was their response?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: The addition to the...

Council Chair Rapozo: No, besides the addition to the lateral. You just said it is a snapshot. So, what is the snapshot? I think it is important that the public knows.

Mr. Dahilig: I think we should go back and find that out.

Council Chair Rapozo: That is my point. The plan is to provide the snapshot for the Council, the Planning Department, and everyone else as we move forward in planning, legislation, zoning, and approvals. I mean, I think it is supposed to be on the radar. I think the plan is supposed to inform the community of what should be on the radar. This takes out any implication or any kind of possibility that we are nearing capacity. It takes all of that out. Really, as long as I have been on this Council since 2002 we have always been told we have five (5) years left, we have five (5) years left, we have five (5) years left. Ever since then, the mountain has grown and grown and grown, but that needs to stop. I want it to be real. That is all I am saying. I want it to be real and not hiding and saying, "Oh, we are not going to say that because then it is going to make us look bad." We are looking bad. It is bad. So, we need to dictate that.

Committee Chair Chock: Any further questions? Okay. What I would like to do is call the meeting back to order.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: If we can, I know we already have a motion for this amendment on the table, but I would like to be able to take out the ones that are in question. It sounds like we need some follow-up on. That is the one on page 70, page 123, the restrooms...

Councilmember Yukimura: Why do you not talk by item number?

Committee Chair Chock: Yes, where is your item numbers?

Councilmember Yukimura: The item number is on the left.

Committee Chair Chock: I do not have that on mine.

Councilmember Yukimura: Oh, you should be looking at this. March 3rd.
It has the date.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Here we go. Thank you.

Council Chair Rapozo: Maybe the Chair can get a good copy.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Item 3, item 20, and item...Chair,
which one was the restrooms?

Council Chair Rapozo: You took mine.

Committee Chair Chock: Oh. 16.

Councilmember Yukimura: No, 16 just needs an "s."

Committee Chair Chock: It is insignificant.

Councilmember Yukimura: Can we consider it...

Council Chair Rapozo: 20 is the bathrooms.

Councilmember Yukimura: A typo that we can just include.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Councilmember Yukimura: No, we cannot.

Committee Chair Chock: We have to redo that one.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, we will just include it then.

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes.

Committee Chair Chock: And bring it back one (1) time.

Councilmember Yukimura: Later on.

Committee Chair Chock: The items that we have brought up, if we can
exclude those and maybe we can withdraw our motion and...

Councilmember Kagawa: Can I?

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, go ahead.

Councilmember Kagawa: What is the purpose? We are taking it out, we
are going to vote to approve the rest of them besides number 3 and 20, right? The
solid waste...

Committee Chair Chock: And 16.

Councilmember Yukimura: 3, 16, and 20.

Councilmember Kagawa: But what is the purpose? We going to take it out and then what? Defer it. Let us just defer the whole thing and come with a clean amendment.

Councilmember Yukimura: We can do that.

Councilmember Kagawa: I am ready to approve the plan. I think these are what you call *manini* things. This is a plan developed by the community and I have no problems moving it today and voting on this amendment. I do not think we will ever come up with a plan that satisfies every single Councilmember. Again, that is my preference to vote on it and move it. We have three (3) members voting, myself, Councilmember Hooser if you agree, Councilmember Hooser, we can get this out of Committee today. Again, my preference is if we are going to defer it, let us just defer the whole thing and go clean it up for the next Committee Meeting. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. The discussion that I had earlier also, we have not even gotten to the larger plan yet. My hope was that we could clean this up because this is more of housekeeping kind of things. They are not as significant, I think, as the bigger questions that are forthcoming in the next hour or so before lunch. I do not mind deferring the whole thing and fixing it up and we will just bring it back for the next Committee. That is fine with me or if you folks feel like the Planning Department wants to take what we can now, we can do that. Chair.

Council Chair Rapozo: I just want to say that I am a non-voting member today like Councilmember Yukimura. The Committee is going to make the determination. What I brought up today is not a deal breaker for me. I am not going to not support the bill if what I am asking for does not happen. Just so that you know, Chair, if you are trying to count votes. I can tell you that I plan to support this bill. I made those suggestions for discussion purposes, but I am going to defer to what the Committee recommends.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Council Chair Rapozo: So, it is not a deal breaker for me. I would hope that we could move this out today.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay.

Council Chair Rapozo: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Councilmember Hooser.

Councilmember Hooser: It is my understanding that we are talking about three (3) items. We are talking about an "s" on arts center, we are talking about an "is" and a "was," and we are talking about adding in or deleting the provision that eliminates the bathroom or changing that. I mean, why could we not just do that?

Committee Chair Chock: Why do we not do that?

Councilmember Hooser: Yes. I mean, it would take ten (10) minutes or whatever.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes.

Councilmember Hooser: Staff has to redo something.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes, let us do that. We will take a break now.

Councilmember Yukimura: Why do we not talk about the important issues while the staff is working on the smaller issues?

Committee Chair Chock: I like that idea. Can we do that, staff? Can we figure out these amendments and continue with our meeting? Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: For clarification, on line item 3, we are going to put back in the sentence that says, "The existing Kekaha Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF) [is] was projected..." We are going to say that it "was" projected to reach capacity in 2014? So, we are going to add in that statement? Is that the amendment?

Councilmember Hooser: That is fine with me.

Councilmember Kagawa: You got that, Christiane? Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: That is one (1). The other is the "s" that we talked about and then other two (2) are referring to the removal of the restroom and the...

Councilmember Yukimura: Just take that out for now.

Committee Chair Chock: No. Just number 20, right?

Councilmember Kagawa: Number 20.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes. Maybe we can take that one out completely for now and we can work on that if it needs to come back, right?

Councilmember Kagawa: You are saying that instead of deleting, we should put it back in?

Committee Chair Chock: That is correct.

Councilmember Hooser: That we should just not delete.

Committee Chair Chock: That is right. Not delete.

Councilmember Kagawa: Not delete?

Councilmember Hooser: Leave it as it is.

Committee Chair Chock: Leave it as is.

Councilmember Kagawa: Leave it as is.

Committee Chair Chock: I know we are going to get a briefing on the CIP soon too.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you. Yes. I am fine with that.

Committee Chair Chock: We will continue with that, getting that worked on, come back this, and I would like to move the discussion towards the large questions of the plan or the larger plan. Again, I was told that while we might be able to get the votes to move this forward to Council, that it would be delayed there for a long time if we did so. What I would like to do is make sure that what we leave with today at least if we are going to defer is to be very clear about what it is the issues are that we want to address and figure out if we can get it done by April 1st which is not the next Committee Meeting but the following after that because we have another plan coming up. If by that time the answers are not suitable to the members, I would like for us to then move it to the Council so that we can all vote on it, alright? I know Councilmember Yukimura wants to lead this here. Go ahead, JoAnn.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I really want to commend SSFM and the Planning Department for very excellent work. The plan is very readable, actually enjoyable to read. It is comprehensive except for one (1) major thing which I am going to address. I feel like it is a very high quality plan that will serve us well into the future. My concern is the lack of a transportation component for Līhu'e. As I read both the South Kaua'i Plan and the Līhu'e Plan I became so aware of the fact that the South Kaua'i Plan is the only community or General Plan on this island that is a land use and transportation plan. It is not because of anyone's fault except that the circumstances on South Kaua'i allowed for a circulation plan to be done prior to the community plan even starting, and because of that, there was a foundation for work that just used the Kōloa-Po'ipū Circulation Plan and then turned it into a circulation plan that is part of the Land Use Plan. It is my thought that we should never fund a community plan without a transportation component also funded. To me, that is a big gap and I would like some thought about how we fill it even if it will be subsequent to this Land Use Plan. On page 93, you show how we are going to get four thousand (4,000) more units in the Līhu'e area. My question is what kind of traffic will that generate and how are we going to handle that? I do not want somebody to say, "Oh, we will just do a bypass" because I have not seen any data about the short trips and how many can be alleviated by walking, biking, and transit. We really need something like that in order for us to be able to proceed to even approve zoning for any of these much less for the developments that has already been zoned and not yet built. That is my question about the transportation component to this Land Use Plan.

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

Mr. Dahilig: Thank you, Councilmember. I think you do raise a good point. Like anything, part of what this plan also does is it is also a gap analysis. It is also identifying things that either need further study of things that need further refinement either through further legislation or through further study. When you look at page 101 of the plan, page 101 sets forth a number of items that we have identified either that cannot be implemented from a short-term basis or things that in a sense need more study. For instance, a comprehensive circulation plan that was done on South Kaua'i. The difference between South Kaua'i and this particular

plan is like you mentioned, we did have some run up due to that grant that was obtained so that funding from an exaction that was obtained to develop part of the circulation plan within South Kaua'i that Jim Charlier did.

Councilmember Yukimura: It was not an exaction.

Mr. Dahilig: Oh, it was a grant. Sorry. I think part of what we did was knowing that we had that already in the books, we wanted to just build upon what that was and extend a little bit more of that discussion out to the areas that were not covered originally by that plan. In this particular plan where we are looking at Līhu'e, we adjusted the scope to more so focus on more of the complete streets and street design elements that you see more typical of more intense urban areas. Knowing that a lot of the community division was geared towards discussions on greater density and things about trying to limit the amount of sprawl. A lot of the discussion was meant from a micro standpoint. I want to turn this over to Cheryl after because in terms of the connectivity between the nodes, that was very clearly studied. The team actually did go out with Dan Burden to also beyond the micro, look at the macro and understand how beyond just the small nodes that we are looking at, biking and walking. How do you get between the nodes? I think one of other thing that was discussed was essentially what the DOT's current network is? So, that was also covered. From a historical standpoint, the County has had disagreements with some of DOT's approaches towards (inaudible). That is something that I think we do understand and work within but also identifies as gaps in our jurisdictional authority. I will turn it over to Cheryl to kind of give you some background as to the approach on the transportation evaluation.

Ms. Soon: Adding to what Mike has shared with you, the plan does look at shuttle circulators for the transit systems that work within the Līhu'e district to encourage those trips that are suitable to transit because it may be a little longer than just a walking opportunity. So, we called for a number of circulators and we did work with the transit agency on that. We actually adjusted them based on some input of things that they were actually looking to start putting in place. We identified a number of bicycle paths that would allow people to take shorter trips on bicycles.

Councilmember Yukimura: Where are those bike paths?

Ms. Soon: It is on the map.

Councilmember Yukimura: Can you point out which map?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: On page 105.

Ms. Soon: The challenge of course with bicycles is that many of them that we have identified would still have to be built as bicycle path routes are (inaudible). They are mostly on existing routes. Some of them are actually on new routes.

Councilmember Yukimura: I do not see any bike paths. Oh, wait, page 105?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: Sorry. Okay.

Ms. Soon: The principles involved in the compact development would be that the developer who is working in the areas of change would include sidewalks in those areas. They are all within a ten (10) minute walking distance of the downtown core of Līhu'e or the downtown core that we hope to see reemerge in Hanamā'ulu or in Puhi. Pedestrian facilities are also addressed and a walk score was given for the areas. The discussion on that is on page 105, and it does refer to the Multimodal Plan. We discussed the integration of these modes in community meetings. A good example that comes to mind came from the Hanamā'ulu meeting where the discussion was, yes I would love to ride the transit bus line, but I have to go there in the dark, wait in the dark, walk in the street to get there because there is no sidewalk to get there, and no light. So, there begins to be key steps that can be taken that brings several modes together, but transit is a very core mode that is looked at throughout this plan sometimes it is an issue of getting people and allowing them to wait safely, at least their perception of safety, because the commute mode is often taking place in the dark. The community was seeing the relationship between these things and I think it allows the County as it moves forward with its multimodal plans, to bring some of those things together. Safe Routes to School is another very good example along the same line.

Councilmember Yukimura: Do you feel that with these different projected facilities that we are going to be able to handle the four thousand (4,000) additional units? The four thousand (4,000) additional is in addition to what Grove Farm already has planned, right?

Ms. Soon: That is correct.

Councilmember Yukimura: So, in terms of unbuilt yet, we are talking about maybe seven thousand (7,000) more units in the Līhu'e area? Population wise...

Ms. Soon: An average of two and a half (2½) maybe.

Councilmember Yukimura: Fourteen thousand (14,000) more people.

Ms. Soon: Yes. We are looking at taking it to twenty-three thousand (23,000).

Councilmember Yukimura: This system is going to accommodate the transportation needs within and through Līhu'e?

Ms. Soon: What this plan does not do and what the Multimodal Plan also does not do, it does not speak to service levels. So, how frequently the bus would have to come therefore how much equipment you would have to have, and how much investment the County would need to make to have the service levels reach a certain point that the mode share is twenty-five...

Councilmember Yukimura: Shifted.

Ms. Soon: Yes, is noticeably shifted. That is going to be, in my opinion, your ongoing challenge. The fact that you have concentrated communities that can walk to the bus stops, can walk to service facilities, and are using the short-term rides for using your bus system, you can set priorities regarding which lines whether you add a new line or whether you provide fifteen (15) minutes frequency instead of thirty (30) minute frequencies area all part of your challenge to

make those choices. We when you have someone develop in an area that we have identified in this plan, you have essentially the negotiating tool to ask them to build the bus stops, to build the bicycle facilities, and to build the sidewalks. You have the policy direction that if they have not come forward with that in their proposals, to challenge them why they have not and to ask them to bring it back in.

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, we just do not have the money to make the busses come frequently or to expand our base yard space which by the way is why earmarking an excise tax for transportation is so important.

Committee Chair Chock: Stay on subject.

Councilmember Yukimura: I am right on subject. Can you show me the urban growth boundary?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Sure.

Councilmember Yukimura: I mean, we are talking about how to make this happen, right, in a plan?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Correct.

Councilmember Yukimura: What page are we on?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Page 96.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Hulumalu Road is outside of the urban edge boundary.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Correct. Well, it is right on the edge if you look at the southern and then as it continues on, it is no longer in the urban growth boundary.

Councilmember Yukimura: I mean, I am just trying to understand how the bike facilities service the urban area. In terms of the next step for implementing the transportation system that would be needed to support this Land Use Plan, are those included in your recommendations?

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: In the implementation and the monitoring section under Capital Improvement Projects on page 119 there are several tables in the implementation section that lists projects any of which, if implemented, would bring us closer to reaching those goals.

Councilmember Yukimura: Show me which ones those are.

Ms. Soon: While Lea is showing you the section, we made up numbers for these. For example, the pedestrian projects, we numbered them Ped 1, Ped 2, Ped 3, et cetera.

Councilmember Yukimura: I see that.

Ms. Soon: That is not your naming system, but it would presumably become a naming system under the County's CIP Ordinance.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: If you start out on page 199 Table 6-5, there are recommended transit projects there, parking, and complete streets. On page 120, we have bicycle facilities, next page, pedestrian CIP projects, and then going on to page 122, roadway.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. In the CIP transit projects, I do not see anything for a new base yard and without a new base yard, we cannot even buy extra busses or do more frequency. So, I am concerned that there is not a comprehensive approach to developing this system that is going to be needed to support the land transportation system, and maybe that is what a circulation plan would help do. No?

Ms. Soon: I see them as two (2) separate types of documents. What we have done here is within the Līhu'e district. The need for an island wide short range transit plan under Federal Transportation Agency (FTA) guidelines and others would have included a base yard, but that was really not our assignment. Our assignment was to do the Land Use Plan for the Līhu'e district. We touch on lots of other things like island wide park plans. So, we try to connect back and forth, but the need for island wide bus plans, I would see as a separate assignment.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Alright. You have an implementation section, right?

Committee Chair Chock: Are we still on the transportation, Councilmember Yukimura?

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes. Do you have an implementation section with indicators?

Committee Chair Chock: 6.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Section 6. The indicators themselves is actually at the end of the plan.

Councilmember Yukimura: Policies for the Līhu'e district, you have transportation policies there? By the way, I really appreciate your section on Kalepa which does include the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) possibilities. So, thank you very much for including that.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: On page 126 are the sections on monitoring and evaluation, measures of success, and indicators that we want to use in order to measure how these projects are implemented and working basically.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. With respect to transportation, number of increased lanes for bicycle users and number of increased pedestrian sidewalks, I would like you to use number of trips that are bicycle and the number of trips that are pedestrian. I think that is a more accurate indication of whether people are using these facilities that we might be measuring. Number of trips that are transit trips.

Ms. Soon: I would only comment on that. I do a lot of work with different agencies that are in the transition process to performance measurement. You are correct. A measurement of use is always preferred to a measurement of how many meetings you held or how many lanes you have, but

sometimes the transition requires getting through the territory. Certainly it is a success to know how many miles of sidewalk you have added and how many miles of bike path, but it is much better to be measuring the use of them. I think that is your call which way you go. It is going to be a leap because it requires a separate measurement which is probably some kind of a survey out in the community.

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, I think in our built environment committee we are looking at indicators. So, that trip analysis is essential. Mike, I hope that we can develop data gathering that is going to give us solid indicators for whether we are achieving our goals.

Mr. Dahilig:

I think that is well taken.

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like to see that added at least here. Moving to another issue which is Lihu'e Town Core walkability. I may have missed it, but I do not see any mention of underground utilities. I just know that when you have big spreading trees which conflict with overhead utilities, walking is so much more pleasant. I think I raised this at the workshop we had. I know there are issues with it, but you do not have to figure everything out in this plan to have an aspiration or a direction that we want to work toward in terms of making Lihu'e a walkable community. I remember seeing some paragraph about sense of place, about walkability, and Lihu'e Town Core that if we could add some language there, that would be good. The need for industrial space. Did we include that? I know my friend Luke Evslin who is a young entrepreneur did a whole blog about that as someone looking for manufacturing space. I know we have an overabundance of commercial space in the Lihu'e area, but industrial space, have we addressed that?

Ms. Soon: We did address it. There have been subsequent questions by a number of folks. The projection for the amount of industrial space that would be needed on a per capita basis, what was already approved in the previous project but not built out by the airport would satisfy it. In fact, it exceeds what the projected need is.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Ms. Soon: I was privy to an E-mail correspondence from a particular person who was looking to, I think, build canoes and could not find a suitable...

Councilmember Yukimura: That might be Luke.

Ms. Soon: ...a suitable place. That specific need is not the kind of thing that the plan can address. He could not find it at a price that made it work for him, but that is part of a business plan. He either builds his own. The configuration of the industrial space really goes beyond what this plan can do.

Councilmember Yukimura: But a fabrication and value added manufacturing has to be one of our goals. Industrial space should be available, but it is like housing. If it is not affordable, it is not available even if it is physically available. To me, that is a problem we need to address and it is related to another question I wanted to ask about the monopoly of landownership in Lihu'e and how that affects the development of this town. I think that is related.

Mr. Dahilig: I think we all around that table at some point or another picked up Land & Power and read that book and understood how and why landownership and land tenure is what it is at this juncture. I think where we are focused on is understanding that many of the areas that we are looking at do fall into common ownership with one (1) particular landowner. I think we are acutely aware of that. They were at the table for these discussions, but I think where we would like to steer some of these issues concerning whether or not land tenure has been so centralized that it does not give the community enough power is this notion of allowing the community the opportunity to actually live on the land, own their own home, and regulate it appropriately. I think those are the broader themes that from a balance standpoint we were trying to look at. As much as landowners may own a lot of these large tracks of land, the need for housing is necessitated whether fortunately or unfortunately to engage these landowners sometimes because we need to be able to provide housing. It is a catch-22. We would like to say that land distribution would be a little bit more diversely distributed on the island, but that is a fact of the sugar plantations and how things were back one hundred (100) years ago. It is a set of facts we are having to deal with now. I think that is where a lot of our balancing elements to not allow landowners from dictating specifically what the community is allowed and not allowed to do is by proposing certain policy elements, is exercise the community's tool which is police power which is exercised by this body, to come in and make those broader preservation types of arguments and those types of things. It is a matter of fact. I do not want to beat around the bush and say that we do not recognize it, but it is part of the rules of engagement.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Councilmember Hooser: I had a follow-up question.

Committee Chair Chock: Please.

Councilmember Hooser: I think Councilmember Yukimura raised a very good point. In the context of the plan we talked about industrial opportunities, we talked about the availability in the airport area, and we talked about the monopoly of the landownership. We have an Affordable Housing Ordinance and it is in terms of policy development. Has it been thought about in the plan? Has the Planning Director or the Planning Department thought about having an industrial affordable ordinance? Given the monopoly, they will build to the highest price and the highest configuration of whether it is warehouses or whatever. Perhaps if you have not thought about that, I think we need to think about that. If these developers are coming forward and they are going to maximize their profit which they are entitled to, but we are giving them a public benefit of allowing them to do this. We need to, I think, consider providing some opportunity for affordable warehouse industrial commercial space if we are going to support industry and support new businesses. Have you folks considered this at all?

Mr. Dahilig: Your comments are exactly on point and even dovetailing back to some of the questioning that was raised to the Housing Director concerning how do we ensure that developers are not just building to the maximum profit, that they are building product that meets our needs. That is where the tie into Form-Based Code is real critical here because we are attempting to actually define the product more specifically versus letting product be built at the choice of what the market freely wants. I want to give an example. Right now we regulate in our Euclidian form on density. Let us say you had a R-20 density, you can build anything up to R-20, but the fact of the matter is when you look at what our housing situation

is and yet what the market is bearing, the demand and what everybody wants to build to for profit margin are things that are R-4 or R-6. I think what we need to do and the plan outlines this very clearly, is engage something like a Form-Based Code to more specifically steer the product and the uses to more integrated things like what Mr. Evslin wants to do. You do not necessarily have to have something specifically in the industrial area, but if you have something that is in the commercial area that is a little bit more of a flex space, can that help spurn an opportunity for him? Those are the discussions that still need to occur. The plan is stubbed out to have Form-Based Code element type of regulation that you see as a test case in the South Kaua'i Plan as an opportunity to address a lot of these product issues that I think are coming down the pipeline. Yes, it is not specifically address here, but it provides that stub out that when we get to that point of actually implementing the zoning regulation, we can do exactly those types of things.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: I just wanted to add. These are new conversations that have been coming up during both community plan processes. This is a need that is felt island wide, I just wanted to say. I do not live in Līhu'e. I live in Kekaha. Also on the West Side, the need for more...not all over the place, but for industrial spaces for manufacturing, for fabricating, and even for small automotive businesses so that these things are not done in people's garages. We are saying it is an island wide conversation. We are just starting to hear these conversations coming up and also on the other side, Form-Based Code is a new conversation for us too that we are still kind of exploring. From all of the examples we are seeing in the mainland about how these are implemented, we also want to make sure that what we are implementing fits our character. We are moving along in the conversations that way. As Mike said, this kind of introduces these conversations and we hope that it will carry forward with the General Plan update and also the updates of all the other community plans on the island which is still necessary.

Ms. Soon: Can I add two (2) other quick thoughts to this conversation? One of the advantages of having a larger landowner is that they are more likely to develop in a master plan fashion and that does allow you to have the negotiations whereas if you are having to try to accomplish something from a lot of smaller landowners, it is a different type of challenge. So, that can be used to your advantage. As we have seen even on Kaua'i over the last two (2) or three (3) decades, it has shifted from Amfac to other property owners in the current. Changes do take place, but what carries with those transitions is the knowledge of what this plan is going to be requiring of the new owner should there be a new owner. I think you can use that to your advantage as those come along.

With regard to industrial, the thought that I wanted to add, when we did a lot of the work for Kapolei on O'ahu, industrial was a specific problem because that developer, Campbell Estate now Kapolei Property Development, would only do the industrial in leasehold and that really limited the flexibility of an owner buying something wanting to do something with it. Over time, the market drove that away. They just would not buy into the leasehold although theoretically it is less expensive and therefore providing it. It really was not serving the needs. The leasehold issue is important when it comes to industrial.

Councilmember Hooser: Thank you. One (1) more follow-up and I appreciate the Councilmembers allowing me to break in. I appreciate the conversation that is going. Specific to the plan, I know we have specific references to affordable housing, our affordable housing needs, and income. This is eighty percent (80%) of whatever. Do we have anything in the plan similarly about industrial or

commercial space that the need is to provide x number of units or square footage at affordable rates, however that is defined. If that is not in there, I was wondering if we could think about potentially adding something like that. I think it is an important point that is raised to support entrepreneurship and build our business base. Thank you.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: I think so. While it was not specifically a recommendation or a large conversation, it came up especially at the end when we were looking at the drafts of the plan. I think it became apparent at that point that the industrial part of it was a conversation that maybe in the past we never fully recognized, but it became apparent at that point. I think that it is a good idea to maybe add a little bit more verbiage about where in the future we can go or that we should explore in order to make that product more accessible to those who need it. We need it for agriculture.

Councilmember Hooser: Right.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: It goes hand in hand with our agriculture industry that we want to start bringing forward. We can look into it.

Councilmember Hooser: At the minimum, maybe some strong language acknowledging that this is important to us. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: You are welcome. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: What I would like to do is we have about half an hour and we have to take a break for lunch and a caption break here. I want to be sure that we are moving towards specific and tangible things that you folks can work on so that we can make a determination if we can move forward. I do have one (1) area that I would like to see maybe relooked at. It is in regards to water. The question came up in public testimony as well. I think it talks about it on page 68. It talks about the necessity of a water plan update. Again, I think the message that we got today is infrastructure is so important. Come on, let us make sure that it gets done. The words used here is that a water plan is strongly recommended. I would say that it is a prerequisite and that this plan would at the very least, at least point to or the plan would point to how distribution is being met for the projected growth. Now I think that is probably there somewhere in the Water Department, but I would like to be able to make that connection somehow here. Also, what it does not talk about which I think is a growing concern that we might want to include is equal and fair access. That has been a discussion. I am not sure if it is...yes. Equal and fair access in general, I think. That could be to farmers or to the public because that is a big need and concern in that plan. If we can put some time and effort into that. There is more like verbiage I understand. I appreciate that it is already in there. It is like that informs that this has to be a plan and I just want to make sure that this has some backbone to it and we get to it.

Ms. Kaiaokamalie: And some direction that we can provide because as I mentioned, the Water Department looks forward to using the numbers that we developed in the SMS report and in this community plan as well.

Committee Chair Chock: That is all I have here. Follow-up on that?

Councilmember Hooser: Well, I have some new questions, but I did not mean to hijack Councilmember Yukimura's time...

Committee Chair Chock: No, I am sorry. I just thought we...

Councilmember Hooser: ...when I interjected my follow-up question. I do have a few questions.

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like to...

Committee Chair Chock: Can we do this in twenty (20) minutes? Do we feel like we can do that? That is what my hope would be.

Councilmember Hooser: My questions are fairly concise, I think.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. I think we have a process question here.

Councilmember Kagawa: I have been listening to Councilmember Yukimura's questions for about an hour. I would like to hear other members of Committee questions. I think if Councilmember Yukimura has this dialogue, I think she should spend some time with them because a lot of the questions asking them seems like it is between them. I think let us get the Committee to get to a point where we can move this item or if it is going to be a deferral because you folks need more time to spend with Planning to come up with amendments, then let us just defer it. The way I feel is I am comfortable with what this group came up with. Is it perfect? Do I agree with everything that is there or missing? Probably not, but the group came up with it, I think it is a good overall plan, and let us focus on trying to get to a decision at some point or another whether we are going to try and hammer it out of Committee or whether we are going to defer it, and then, let us defer it and be more well prepared the next time. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: Mr. Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: I do think that we can get the amendments through before lunch. So, I want to make sure we save some time for that and goes as far as we can. If we cannot, if it does not get all vetted, then we will have to defer it obviously until April.

Councilmember Yukimura: Mr. Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: I have three (3) more key issues. I do not think any I have said today is irrelevant to this plan or is non-substantive in terms of an issue that is of importance to this area of Līhu'e. We spent an hour on the small things. We have not spent even an hour on the big things. It is our responsibility as elected Councilmembers to raise these issues on a twenty (20) year plan that is going to be passed. I am sorry that Councilmember Kagawa has to focus on time rather than on substance. This is not a conversation that I should just have with Planning.

This is a public discussion that the community needs to be involved with because they are affected by it. This is their plan. I think we should have these public discussions and if I am not on point, then please correct me. If I am talking about substance, I do not want to be short-shrifted on the time.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, hold on one (1) second. I totally agree. I think that is an important discussion. What I really want to leave with today though are the questions. So, I do not want get into one (1) question and spend the whole time on it. I want to make sure that these people leave with those things so that they can actually work responses and so that we can have more dialogue in seeking resolution. That is why I want to make sure that those things are presented upfront.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Committee Chair Chock: Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: In response, if a Councilmember asks questions we would not have spent this long. I think a lot of it I am hearing her opinion or what she thinks should be in there and that is not appropriate at this time. It is appropriate during discussion. I think let us ask questions as we should at this time.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Councilmember Hooser.

Councilmember Hooser: Thank you, Chair, for steering this discussion on. I know we are running short of time for lunch. I think the discussion is valuable. The remarks I made just recently about the need for affordable industrial capacity and the request to have it put into the plan would not have come forth without the discussion generated by Councilmember Yukimura. I agree all of us sometimes tend to ramble and go off. I think we should accommodate each other as much as we can. I think the public discussion is important and that we should hear what each other had to say about this. I am not here to rubber stamp the plan that is presented. I want to explore the different aspects of the plan. I believe that we are the policy making body of the County that if there are elements of the plan that we feel are lacking that we should exercise the prerogative to amend it and include the other items in it. I think the conversation is useful and that we should take whatever time we need to deliberate on it thoughtfully. I do have a few more questions and follow-up whenever you are ready.

Committee Chair Chock: Great. Thank you. I heard that we have three (3) more on Councilmember Yukimura's side as well as three (3) more on your side.

Councilmember Hooser: Two (2) or three (3).

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. What I understand here is that we probably will not get done at 12:30 p.m. because I want to make sure that at least the amendment gets taken care of. Can we at least introduce what those questions are so that we have a direction before 12:30 p.m.? That means about five (5) till, we will get to the amendment, and we can ask for a deferral. Go ahead.

Councilmember Hooser: Just a brief caveat. This discussion to a significant extent is for the public also. The public does not have the opportunity to

have this kind of conversations that we might have with you. I think it is important for us to raise these questions because many of the questions are the ones the public raises. Committee Chair Chock had brought up the word infrastructure. I believe Councilmember Yukimura talked about implementation. My question is, it seems like we are doing a pretty good job and great job on the plan actually. I mean, I applaud all of you for the great work. I was impressed when I was first briefed on it. Thank you. The "what" and the "where" seems to be pretty clear. This is where we need things, this is affordable housing, and this is growth areas. The "when" and in what order may not be as clear. That would be one (1) question I will have for future. Do you we the water plan first or the transportation plan or do we expand the transportation before we do it? That kind of feedback or input, I think, would be important to have. You do not have to address that now, but that was some of the questions. The roadblocks and challenges to achieve another plan. We have these benchmarks and needs for so many housing units and so much of this. Well, what is there blocking us from getting there? That would be the question. Then, I think that is it. Those are the main questions I had and we can have further discussion on them later. I think that is the intent of the Chair, to share the questions and then our resource people could go out and then come back later and address them. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock:

Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: The three (3) questions that I have, and I actually probably have more, but the three (3) main ones are, if Līhu'e is to be a gathering place and this is twenty (20) year plan, will not this community both as a region and as an island need a larger revenue for performing arts and sports? The Convention Hall has served us beautifully for the last fifty (50) years and I am in awe of the vision of the people who visualized and built the Convention Hall. That is one thousand one hundred (1,100) that can be seated there. If this is a growing community, will we not need a larger covered venue? Probably. Could it be a mix of sports and performing arts? I am not asking that you figure out the design or exact use, but the projection of a need of such a venue, it seems to me should be in the Līhu'e Plan somewhere. Then, the upgrading of Kukui Grove Shopping Center. I think with a new shopping center coming on board and it is somewhat presumptions for me to say it should be upgraded, but I think from our smart growth experience, we know that shopping centers like that are having a hard time and that some reinvention reuse might be a place for some density of housing. A signaling of that possibility even, is that something we can mention in the plan? Climate change adaptation. I see Ruby in the audience. I commend you for including such a section in the plan and I know that especially to our Planning Director, your vision and your awareness of this very current issue has been recognized nationally in the Sea Grant world. On that issue, and maybe you can point out what page that is on. Page 109. It is a very excellent section, but I always wonder whenever there is talk about climate change why it is always about adaptation, why it does not have some discussion about prevention or our role in at least reducing greenhouse gases, and why we should not include as our policies creating our systems such that they reduce greenhouse gas production. I want to recall that our Multimodal Transportation Plan if we implement it, shows that we are going to reduce fossil fuel usage and greenhouse gases by twenty-five percent (25%) I believe, or something in that arena. Just one (1) or two (2) words about one of the implementing steps in the arena of climate change has to be to convert our systems, our existing roads, solid waste, water, and other systems to be climate change neutral or whatever. I would just like to see some connection to the proactive part as well as the adaptive part of climate change. Those were the three (3) other things I wanted to have a discussion on and have your thoughts and opinions about in terms of how we might address that in this plan.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. You folks have received the requests. I just want to get a sense from you folks in terms of timing, responses, and feasibility on your end here as we move forward to the possibility of a deferral.

Mr. Dahilig: I think given the punch list that is provided before the discussion and what we are having now and given the fact that the Council Committee will be handling the South Kaua'i Plan in two (2) weeks, probably hitting both items on the same day may be a bit of an overload.

Committee Chair Chock: Absolutely.

Mr. Dahilig: I would suggest maybe if we had a deferral to the first Committee Meeting in April so that we can kind of hopscotch these plans with each other. It gives us an opportunity as some of these punch list items have come up, to maybe engage the Councilmembers directly on these items to kind of just do some of that pre-discussion and get clear on massaging some potential amendments or language so we can try to get the ball rolling a little more quickly to better use the Council's full body time.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you very much. With that, I think what I would like to do is move towards handling the amendments before lunch and we will come back to this discussion of deferral. Thank you very much.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: Question?

Councilmember Hooser: I believe we moved the amendments. Now do we need to amend the amendments or withdraw the amendments?

Committee Chair Chock: Withdraw would be best, I think.

Councilmember Hooser withdrew his motion to amend Bill No. 2571 as amended, as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto and incorporated here in as Attachment 2.

Committee Chair Chock: Can you withdraw your second?

Councilmember Kagawa withdrew his second.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser moved to amend Bill No. 2571 as amended, as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto and incorporated here in as Attachment 3, seconded by Councilmember Kagawa.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Any questions on the amendments before you? Members, it is pretty clear what we talked about previously. If not, I would like to take a vote on it.

The motion to amend Bill No. 2571 as amended, as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto as Attachment 3 was then put, and

carried by a vote of 3:0:1:1 (*Councilmember Kaneshiro was recused; Councilmember Kualii was excused*).

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. On the question on the main motion, any discussion on the main motion? Yes, Councilmember Hooser.

Councilmember Hooser: Just a brief discussion. Again, I want to thank the Planning Department and all of the good folks that have worked so hard on this issue and the people in the community that contributed. I think we had good discussion today. We might, just for consideration, think about workshops or a workshop if we feel that the extended discussion is going to intrude on other items of business on other calendar. We can certainly set aside the time, is one (1) possibility. Other than that, I will hold my remarks for now. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you. We are asking for now maybe a workshop to discussion what the Council wants and that is even more importantly why Councilmember Kaneshiro needs to be on this issue. If we go to the full Council, we have a strong possibility of a 3:3 split. Does that give proper direction from the Council to the body? I mean, until somebody tells me how in the world does Councilmember Kaneshiro directly benefit from a future Land Use Plan, then I cannot understand why he would have to recuse himself. Again, this plan is developed by the working group and by the Planning Department. To me, the best advice I could have given to them was keep it simple and focus on areas that are important for the purpose of doing that plan. Here, I am kind of hearing now that we should have looked into other things in more detail. I think what it does is when you broaden the scope, when you try to be an expert in all kinds of areas, you open up that can of worms because everybody has different outlooks on what is important. For me, what is important to me is traffic flow with cars. For me, that is a stickler. For other Councilmembers, walkways and bikeways are very important, cementing or hardening and putting curbs is important to them. That is fine. We just have a difference of opinion as far as what is important, where we should improve, and to me, I think the Council would be doing a disservice to the plan if we start picking out amendments in all different areas just because we are not totally satisfied with what is in there. I think that working group did the work. It is our job to either approve it or if there are major flaws that we see, then of course we amend it. We do not leave major flaws that we see in the plan and just ignore them. Of course we fix the major flaws, but we do not nitpick because we as individuals are not happy with the plan. I think that is wrong and that is what I was trying to convey to the Council. It is not to say your word is not important. It is just let us look at the plan as a whole. It is a good plan to me as I read it. I think it is a great plan. We are updating something fifteen (15) years ago that has not been done. Is it perfect? What is perfect? I will leave it at that. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Council Chair Rapozo.

Council Chair Rapozo: I think Ross said it best. I do not think any of us will be satisfied with everything in the plan. I also agree that with all due respect to my colleagues, that the workshops have occurred. The public has had their voice. They have spoken. The Committee has done their work. The consultants have done their work. The Planning Department has done a fabulous job. This plan as I have read it several times, I think, is the best that it will get aside from the minor amendments that can be agreed upon. Again, this Committee has five (5) members

but only three (3) are here today. If we move this out, it goes to the full Council next week where we will have six (6) of seven (7) unless Councilmember Kaneshiro can get his clearance from the Ethics Commission. I do not know if he will be able to do that. If the Committee today is satisfied with what we have, then we should move forward and not defer because Councilmember Yukimura or Councilmember Hooser or Councilmember Rapozo or Councilmember Kagawa is upset with one (1) item or not satisfied. The Committee makes the recommendation to the full Council and the full Council should make the determination whether or not this moves forward or it gets referred back to the Committee because we will not defer it. I will not suggest or I will not allow this thing to be deferred for two (2) weeks so that it bangs with the South Shore Plan. That would be stupid. If this gets deferred, it will be deferred for another month and another month and then another month because you will have dueling Community Plans going on. So, we will never see the end. Again, unless there are some major flaws, this plan should be moved out. This does not require this Council to do anything other than accept some general guidelines. As the applicants come in for zoning, as the housing requirements, and as all of these different matters that the Council will address comes forward the Council has a prerogative to do what they believe is best at that time. This is a snapshot, I think Mike said it best. I would encourage the Committee to move this thing out unless there are some major flaws. I know I heard JoAnn say the transportation (inaudible) is not big enough. Well, I believe personally, me myself, the public safety component is not even in there. We are not talking about expansion of...or the problems with drugs, alcohol, and teen pregnancy. They are all affecting our communities. That is not in there, but is that enough for me to say, "No, I am not going to because I want that in." No, the community did the work. We need to respect that. We need to respect the time that has already been put into this plan and move forward because we could address these issues for the rest of the year, for the rest of this Council term. Is that productive? One of the things we talked about in this new term was getting things done. Today we have an opportunity to move this one (1) step forward so that we can begin implementation. I do not see a reason why it should be deferred. I am not on this Committee, but the Committee can move it forward and let the full Council decide where we have a better representation of the body because we have two (2) absences today. I will suggest that, Mr. Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Council Chair Rapozo: That we will save a lot of time. Again, if the full Council believes that we need more work, then we can set it for the Committee a month from now.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. I know Councilmember Yukimura has some comments as well, but I wanted to get a sense from Councilmember Hooser where he is on moving this forward or the possibility of deferring it.

Councilmember Hooser: This is not my second turn time to talk.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, that is right. It is a question.

Councilmember Hooser: This is responding to your question.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes.

Councilmember Hooser: The last time the plan was updated was 1977. It might be 2035 before we update this again and I believe that we should take the

time needed to have a thorough discussion. If there are elements in the plan that we believe as a majority are lacking, we should be willing and take the time to amend it. I use the example of the affordability factor of industrial land for entrepreneurs in business. I believe strongly that there should be a component in there even if it is only a paragraph or two (2) because this is guidance. When developers come forward, we can look at the plan and say, "No, the plan says you have to have a component for affordable industrial." I believe that is important and I believe we should take the time needed to have a thorough discussion on this. I suggested a workshop because I agree, I do not want it to last forever and our schedule as now, it maybe a month before we talk about it. That was the purpose of that if we are going to have extended discussions. I have not gotten my questions answered yet. I am not prepared to vote in support of this plan today. I would like to see further discussion on it.

Committee Chair Chock: So, you support a deferral rather than moving it to Council?

Councilmember Hooser: Yes, that is correct.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. For the record, I am actually good with the direction of the plan. I believe the discussion can happen in both or either arena. It can continue to happen here in Committee. The fact that it happens is more important to me. Where is insignificant. I would like to see more people involved in this discussion. My hope is that whether it gets deferred or moves forward, we get participation if allowable, and if we can work out way through that and also from Councilmember KipuKai Kualii. Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: The rule is that we do our work in Committee so that we do not hang up a Council Meeting. We are in Committee. This is the first Committee Meeting we have had on this issue. We did have a workshop before the election and I think only Councilmember Chock and I showed up for that. It was a workshop for the whole Council. This is not dragging anything out, to work on it in one (1) Committee or have even a second Committee Meeting. We are prepared. We have come having read this and having our questions ready. It is not just a matter of getting things done in any way. We want to get things done well. The Council is part of the process. If there was not an intention, the Council would work on this issue, it would not come to us. In fact, we are the deciders and how interesting that Councilmember Kaneshiro might be the swing vote, he has no conflict of interest, and it does not matter what he does. There is a lot of contradiction in that. This is a twenty (20) year plan. It is very detailed. It holds a lot of things. It is not that we are upset with the plan. It is an excellent plan, but there are gaps or questions we have and I feel we need to have the time to ask and discuss it. I bet the public will have some input after they have heard these discussions. Part of our job is to raise the issues. I am not a member of the Planning Committee, but I hope that there is a respect for each other that even if you may be satisfied with the plan, you would like every Councilmember to have a chance to look at it and work out some of the issues that they may see are issues. Furthermore, we have two (2) people missing, one (1) who has not been conflicted out and they may want a chance to discuss this. It is probably best in Committee that we do this. I think it is not unreasonable at all to defer it for at least one (1) more Committee Meeting. If we have two (2) or three (3) more, I was the Chair of the Planning Committee when we did the Lihu'e Plan back in 1978, I think it was. We spent many meetings on it. It is not unreasonable to spend some time on what is a very important document to this region and to this island.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. I need a motion either way. If we cannot get to a resolution it will stay in Committee is what I am understanding. Go ahead.

Councilmember Kagawa: I just want to point out we are talking about Councilmember Kaneshiro and all. Councilmember Kaneshiro, it was known that he works for Grove Farm when he put his name on the ballot, first-time candidate, and he finished number 3. Very impressive. The voters know who he worked for, the voters knew when they elected him that he would be deciding on these kinds of things. I think it shows that his employment is supported by the voters of Kaua'i.

Committee Chair Chock: I still need a motion. Councilmember Yukimura, you have a solution for us?

Councilmember Yukimura: No. I just want to say that when he was campaigning, Councilmember Kaneshiro said he would abide by the decision of the Ethics Board when he was asked how he would deal with potential conflicts of interest.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Committee, I really want to steer away from that conversation. We are going to have a briefing on that in Executive Session with our County Attorney and that is where I would like to leave it. I want to get to this. It is lunch time. We have to take a break. Can I get a motion and can I get a second is what the question is.

Councilmember Kagawa: We have a motion to approve, right? Can we vote?

Councilmember Hooser moved to defer Bill No. 2571 as amended to Bill No. 2571, Draft 1 to the April 1, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting.

Councilmember Hooser: I have not had my questions addressed. If we want to come back this afternoon and have further discussion, I might feel differently. I asked several question to the presenters who have not responded at this point and I am not prepared to vote on this. I do not understand what the rush is quite frankly. I do not know what we have to do this now. I think it deserve thought. This is about the future of a major part of our community. I would suggest we defer.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. The motion is to defer.

Councilmember Kagawa: Can I explain my vote?

Committee Chair Chock: Sure.

Councilmember Kagawa: If I do not second this vote to defer then it goes on next week's agenda, I believe.

Council Chair Rapozo: Committee.

Councilmember Kagawa: Oh, it goes to the next Committee agenda. So, that is even worse. We will have a clash of the Kōloa Plan and the Līhu'e Plan. No I am not in a rush to move the item. I mean, just because I am in a rush I am lazy. It is because I support the work the group did and I support the document that I see in front of me. I do not feel that this Council is my way of putting in my personal views

in the plan. That is all I am saying. It is not about rushing. If you want to put words in my mouth, you call it rushing. I will say mine is supporting. Thank you. Thank you, Chair. I will be supporting the motion to defer. Do you need a second?

Council Chair Rapozo: Wait, not yet.

Committee Chair Chock: Oh...

Council Chair Rapozo: I just want to make sure that when we schedule this in response to Councilmember Hooser's request for a workshop, that we give this item the necessary time. So whether it is a workshop, whether it is a date outside of our normal Committee Meeting, whether it is an evening workshop or whatever it is...what I do not want is to be in a position in a month where we are rushing because of time.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes.

Council Chair Rapozo: Whether it is on a Tuesday, a Thursday, an evening, a workshop, I would suggest that you folks decide on a time that we can give it the necessary time because I do believe it is important to get out. Am I in a rush? It is not a rush, but I do not want to spend unnecessary time if we do not have to. If we can get this thing wrapped up in a meeting that is dedicated to this item, then let us do that because all too often we end up being pressed for time in a Committee Meeting. That is up to the Committee. You address that with the staff, but I would suggest we utilize a special dedicated period. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser: If I could follow-up briefly. I think Chair Rapozo raised an excellent issue. My suggestion was we defer to April 1st and between now and then we consider scheduling possibly a workshop to actually do the heavy lifting and discussion and then we come back and vote on April 1st. That was one (1) option. It is up to the Chair though.

Committee Chair Chock: That is an option. I just want to check in with staff also on the possibility of scheduling that or if there are any conflicts in moving this to April 1st, the next Committee Meeting and then also a possibility of a workshop which is something that we have to get clear on so that we can come back ready to have the final discussion in Committee and then move to Council. Where did Christiane go? Let us just defer it until April. We can also make the decision on the workshop next week.

Council Chair Rapozo: It is up to you.

Councilmember Kagawa seconded the motion to defer Bill No. 2571 as amended to Bill No. 2571, Draft 1 to the April 1, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting.

The motion to defer Bill No. 2571 as amended to Bill No. 2571, Draft 1 to the April 1, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting was then put, and carried by a vote of 3:0:1:1 (*Councilmember Kaneshiro was recused, Councilmember Kualii was excused*).

Committee Chair Chock: Aright. Thank you. We are going to go to lunch. I am going to put the Planning Committee in recess actually right now because we are going to come back to, I think, another certificate at 1:30 p.m. Thank you.

There being no objections, the Committee recessed at 12:36 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 2:01 p.m., and the Committee proceeded on its agenda item, as shown in the following Committee Report, which is incorporated herein by reference:

(Councilmember Kaneshiro was noted as present.)

CR-PL 2015-07: on Bill No. 2575 A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 8, KAUAI COUNTY CODE 1987, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO ZONING DESIGNATION FOR CERTAIN NON-ZONED LANDS **(Approved.)**

(Councilmember Kaneshiro was noted as recused at 2:03 p.m.)

The Committee proceeded on its agenda item, as follows:

Bill No. 2576 A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING REGULATIONS, PROCEDURES, ZONING, DEVELOPMENT PLANS, AND FUTURE GROWTH AREAS FOR THE SOUTH KAUAI PLANNING DISTRICT, AND ESTABLISHING EXCEPTIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND ADDITIONS TO CHAPTER 8 AND CHAPTER 9, KAUAI COUNTY CODE 1987, AS AMENDED **(This item was Deferred.)**

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. My request would be that we defer this item everyone, to the next meeting which is the 18th. My plan is to take this similarly to how we did today in terms of trying to get any of the ministerial amendments out of the way and getting our presentation. It is going to be a much longer presentation is my understanding and it will probably be a longer process. If we can get as many of the questions up front about that between now and our Committee Meeting, that way our Planning Department will be ready to respond. I appreciate it. Any further questions about this?

Councilmember Hooser moved to defer Bill No. 2576, seconded by Councilmember Kagawa.

Committee Chair Chock: I forgot public testimony. Anyone would like to testify on the South Shore plan at this time?

There being no objections, the rules were suspended to take public testimony.

There being no one present to provide testimony, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

The motion to defer Bill No. 2576 was then put, and carried by a vote of 3:0:1:1
(*Councilmember Kaneshiro was recused, Councilmember Kuali'i was excused*).

Committee Chair Chock: The bill is deferred to March 18th. This concludes the business of the Planning Committee.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison S. Arakaki
Council Services Assistant I

APPROVED at the Committee Meeting held on April 15, 2015:



MASON K. CHOCK
Chair, Planning Committee

(March 4, 2015)

FLOOR AMENDMENT

Bill No. 2571, Relating to Establishing Procedures, Development Plans, and Future Growth Areas for the Līhu'e Planning District

Introduced By: GARY L. HOOSER (By Request)

Amend Bill No. 2571, by amending SECTION 1, SECTION 2, SECTION 3, SECTION 4, SECTION 5, and SECTION 6 in its entirety to read as follows:

"[SECTION 1. Findings and purpose: The Līhu'e Community Plan was completed by the Planning Department to update the Līhu'e Development Plan of 1976 and was developed through an extensive public participation program and with guidance from a community working group. The purpose of this bill is to repeal the Līhu'e Development Plan of 1976 (Ordinance No. 335, November 29, 1977, 1978 Cumulative Supplement) and replace it with the Līhu'e Community Plan.

SECTION 2. Chapter 10, Article 5, Section 10-5, "Līhu'e Development Plan" of the Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended, is hereby repealed and amended to read as follows:]

SECTION 1. Findings and purpose: The Līhu'e Community Plan was completed by the Planning Department to update the Līhu'e Development Plan of 1976 and was developed through an extensive public participation program and with guidance from a community working group. A community plan adopted by Ordinance under Chapter 10, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended, is the equivalent of a "development plan" referenced in the Charter of the County of Kaua'i, Article XIV, "Planning Department." The purpose of this bill is to repeal Chapter 10, Article 5, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Līhu'e Development Plan of 1976) (Ordinance No. 335, November 29, 1977, 1978 Cumulative Supplement) and replace it with the Līhu'e Community Plan Implementing Ordinance."

SECTION 2. The content of Chapter 10, Article 5, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Līhu'e Development Plan) is hereby repealed.

SECTION 3. The content of Chapter 10, Article 5, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended is replaced by adding new sections as follows and by incorporating by reference the document entitled "Līhu'e Community Plan (2014)":

Article 5. "Līhu'e Community Plan Implementing Ordinance"

Section 10-5.1 Title and Purpose.

(a) This Article shall be known and may be cited as the "Līhu'e Community Plan Implementing Ordinance." It is adopted to implement the intent and purpose of the adopted General Plan and to amend or refine certain portions of the General Plan which are found to be necessary in order to recognize more detailed information and more precise community goals and objectives.

(b) Nature of the Līhu'e Community Plan Ordinance. This Article provides recommendations and policies to direct future development and capital improvements in the Līhu'e Planning District, whose boundary includes the Wailua

River (North), including Kīpū and Kīpū Kai; and from Wai‘ale‘ale mauka to the ocean.

(c) The guidelines of this Article are based on the report entitled “Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014),” a booklet whose major components include:

- (1) Līhu‘e Community Plan Land Use Map
- (2) Urban Edge Boundary for the Līhu‘e District
- (3) Special Planning Areas for the Līhu‘e District
- (4) Future Roadways and Parking in the Līhu‘e District
- (5) Policies for the Līhu‘e District Communities
- (6) Implementation and Monitoring

Section 10-5.2 Vision and Goals

The vision and goals for the region as a whole referred to in this Article, which shall be known as the Līhu‘e Planning District, and its communities, which include Līhu‘e Town and Civic Center, Greater Līhu‘e and Kapaia, Hanamā‘ulu, Puhi-Pū‘ali-Nuhou, Nāwiliwili-Niumalu-Kalapakī, Kīpū, and Kālepa, are described as: Vision for the Līhu‘e Planning District. The Līhu‘e District shall be a place with walkable, compact communities, each distinct yet connected, and each with its own unique identity and sense of place. Green, open spaces between communities serve as visual and physical buffers and evoke Kaua‘i’s rural essence. Līhu‘e Town serves as a destination and gathering place for the island, with a vibrant Town Core and a desirable mix of uses and attractions for residents and visitors.

Section 10-5.3. Implementation of the Līhu‘e Community Plan

The Līhu‘e Community Plan shall serve as a guide for all development within the Līhu‘e Planning District.

The Planning Department shall develop an outreach program to work with existing community organizations and interested individuals to implement the Līhu‘e Community Plan and shall report on the progress made towards implementation, as well as the monitoring of community indicators, to the Planning Commission on an annual basis.

SECTION 4. Severability. If any provision of this Ordinance or application thereof to any person, persons, or circumstances is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect the other provisions or applications of this Ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end, the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

SECTION 5. Material to be deleted is bracketed. New material is underscored. When revising, compiling or printing this ordinance for inclusion in the Kaua‘i County Code 1987, as amended, the brackets, bracketed material, and underscoring need not be included.

SECTION 6. This Ordinance shall take effect upon its approval.”

(Material to be deleted is bracketed. New material is underscored.)

V:\AMENDMENTS\2015\03-04-2015 Bill No. 2571 CNT_cy.docx

(March 4, 2015)

FLOOR AMENDMENT

Relating to Amendments to the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) Booklet as referenced in Bill No. 2571, Establishing Procedures, Development Plans, and Future Growth Areas for the Līhu'e Planning District

Introduced by: Gary L. Hooser (By Request)

1. Amend Executive Summary (page 12, of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the Community Specific Policy for Hanamā'ulu as follows:

"HANAMĀ'ULU

- Intensify commercial development along Kūhiō Highway [o] to serve the needs of the Hanamā'ulu community and reduce driving distance to basic amenities.
- Create a new walkable mixed use center that interfaces with the planned Kohea Loa development and accommodates up to 500 additional housing units."

2. Amend Section 1.6 District Boundary (page 26, of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the first paragraph as follows:

"This Līhu'e Community Plan update selected the same boundaries as the last Līhu'e Development Plan, which coincides with the Līhu'e Judicial District. The Līhu'e District stretches from the northern bank of the Wailua River, [in the north] to [and including] the Pacific Ocean to the East, to Kipū and Kipū Kai in the [west;] South East, Haupu Mountain Range to the South; Mount Wai'ale'ale mauka to the [ocean] west (Figure 1-3)."

3. Amend Section 3.13.4 Solid Waste (page 70 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), as follows:

"[The existing Kekaha Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF) is projected to reach capacity in 2014.] The County of Kaua'i Department of Public Works Solid Waste Division is proposing a vertical expansion [to prolong the life of the facility and provide for continued safe disposal of municipal solid waste.] and the addition of a lateral cell 2 at the existing Kekaha Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF). This will provide for continued safe disposal of municipal solid waste until 2021. Studies and design concepts for a new landfill site and a possible resources recovery park above Hanamā'ulu are in preparation."

4. Amend Section 3.13.5 Schools (page 70 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by adding a new school type and school name following Elementary Schools as follows:

"Public Charter School

Kawaikini New Century Public Charter School (183 students)"

5. Amend Table 3-3 Neighborhood and Beach Parks in Līhu'e District (page 73 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the description of "Līhu'e County Park" as follows:

[Līhu'e County Park] <u>Līhu'e Park</u>	Town Core	[Neighborhood] <u>District</u>	3.28	Umi St.
--	-----------	-----------------------------------	------	---------

6. Amend Subsection Subcomponents (pages 82-85 and pages 116-117 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the period following each Subsection Subcomponent number as follows:

4.2.1.1[.] Līhu'e-Hanamā'ulu Master Plan

4.2.1.2[.] Wailani & Ahukini Makai

4.2.1.3[.] Kohea Loa

4.2.1.4[.] Puakea and Wai'ola

4.2.1.5[.] Rice Camp

4.2.1.6[.] Kalepa Homesteads

4.2.3.1[.] Civic Center Site Improvements Master Plan

4.2.3.2[.] Līhu'e Town Core Urban Design Plan

6.2.4.1[.] Requirements for Development in Mixed Use Special Planning Areas

6.2.4.2[.] Demonstrating Consistency with the Līhu'e Community Plan

6.2.4.3[.] Requirements for Development in Mixed Use Special Planning Areas

6.2.4.4[.] Concurrence with Infrastructure Development

7. Amend Section 4.2.1.5. Rice Camp (page 83 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), as follows:

"The County [Housing Department] recently opened Phase I of [is developing] Rice Camp as a rental project designed for elderly residents. It [will be] is located on 5.2 acres on Ho'ala Street and [will] includes 60 one- and two-bedroom rental apartments. The units are arranged in one and two story buildings, with an emphasis on walking opportunities within the project and to the retail/commercial establishments on Rice Street. [When the first 60 units are completed, there will still be available vacant acreage in the property to allow for additional units to be constructed.] Phase II of the project is expected to provide 24-48 additional housing units to Rice Camp."

8. Amend Section 4.2.3.1. Civic Center Site Improvements Master Plan (page 85 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the last paragraph as follows:

"The improvements proposed in the Civic Center Master Plan, which are depicted in Figure 4-3[.], are currently being revised to reflect new priorities and funding opportunities. 'Eiwa Street is now envisioned as a transit hub with pedestrian connections to increase safety. Surface parking will be reconfigured to accommodate parking on street."

9. Amend Section 5.1.5, Agricultural Lands (page 98 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting main bullet #3 as follows:

"[• Establish a minimum goal for the Designation of IAL in the Līhu'e District.]"

10. Amend Section 5.1.5 Agricultural Lands (page 98 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting main bullet #6 as follows:
- “[• Explore the creation of a food hub in the Līhu‘e District with community involvement.]”
11. Amend Table 5-1 Kaua‘i Multimodal Land Transportation Plan Programs: Key Elements for Līhu‘e (page 101 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the last element under the heading “Transit Planning,” as follows:
- “[Initiate New Local Circulators (shuttles)
- Develop performance criteria for routes
 - Implement new local transit shuttles]”
12. Amend Figure 5-5 Future Roadways and Parking in the Līhu‘e District (page 103 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by moving the inset map to the side to allow a better view of the main map.
13. Amend Figure 5-5 Future Roadways and Parking in the Līhu‘e District (page 103 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the reference to the Proposed Parking Structure as follows:
- “[P Proposed Parking Structure]”
14. Amend Section 5.6 Housing (page 107 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the second paragraph as follows:
- “The County adopted a [new Chapter of the] Workforce Housing Policy for the County of Kaua‘i (Ordinance 860) in [2014] 2008 [specifically to address workforce housing]. The ordinance includes workforce housing requirements for residential and resort developments, and codifies procedures used to administer housing development programs. Requirements applicable to residential and resort developments are shown in the text box.”
15. Amend Section 5.6 Housing (page 107 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the title in the yellow text box as follows:
- “WORKFORCE HOUSING ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE [864] 860)
REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND RESORT
DEVELOPMENT”
16. Amend Section 5.7 Economic Development (page 108 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the 3rd bullet under “Policies” as follows:
- “Identify County resources, programs, and incentives to support and enhance Kaua‘i’s key economic clusters and potential growth areas, including commercial kitchen and business incubators, a [digital] creative technology center, an art center, and tax incentives for entrepreneurs and small businesses.”

17. Amend Section 5.7 (page 108 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the 6th bullet under “Policies” as follows:

- “Enhance and upgrade agricultural infrastructure in the Līhu‘e District, including irrigation, and meat and dairy processing [, and the Kaua‘i Tropical Fruit Disinfestation facility].”

18. Amend Tables 6-4 through 6-13 (pages 118-124 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the word “Projects” in the table headings as follows:

“Table 6-4 Recommended BUILDING AND FACILITY CIP [Projects] for the Līhu‘e District”

“Table 6-5 Recommended CIP TRANSIT [Projects]”

“Table 6-6 Recommended PARKING and Access CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-7 Recommended COMPLETE STREETS CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-8 Recommended BICYCLE FACILITIES CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-9 Recommended PEDESTRIAN CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-10 Recommended ROADWAY CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-11 Recommended COUNTY OWNED UTILITY CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-12 Recommended PARKS AND RECREATION CIP [Projects]”

19. Amend Table 6-6 Recommended PARKING and Access CIP Projects (page 119 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting PA-1 and PA-2 (and renumbering PA-3 and PA-3 accordingly) as follows:

“[PA-1	Līhu‘e Park and Convention Center Parking Structure (Part of Līhu‘e Civic Center Site Improvement Project)	\$3,050,000	Public Works – Building Division	County Six-year CIP Program: Līhu‘e Civic Center Site Improve-ments. Bond (\$3.05M) Phasing: See Below**]”
“[PA-2	Civic Center Parking Structure (Part of Līhu‘e Civic Center Site) Improvement Project	\$3,050,000	Public Works – Building Division	County Six-year CIP Program: Līhu‘e Civic Center Site Improve-ments. Bond (\$3.05M) Phasing: See Below**]”

20. Amend Table 6-12 Recommended PARKS AND RECREATION CIP Projects (page 123 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting PKS-1 and PKS-2 (and renumber PKS-3 thru PKS-11 accordingly) as follows:

"[PKS-1	A new comfort station and parking scheme for the soccer complex at Lydgate Park.		Parks & Recreational Facilities	County CIP: FY2014]"
"[PKS-2	A comfort station for the Lydgate Park campsite.		Parks & Recreational Facilities	Parks MP]"

21. Amend Table 6-13 Recommended ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CIP Projects, (page 124 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting ECD-7 (and renumber ECD-8 thru ECD-20 accordingly) as follows:

"[ECD-7	Renovations to Kaua'i Tropical Fruit Disinfestation Facility	\$1,000,000	Agriculture Development Corp.]"
---------	--	-------------	---------------------------------

22. Amend Table 6-13 Recommended ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CIP Projects (page 124 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting ECD-11 (and renumbering ECD-12 thru ECD-20 accordingly) as follows:

"[ECD-11	Wilcox Hospital improvements to develop 200-stall parking structure, expand solar farm, and install CT Scanner		Wilcox Hospital]"
----------	--	--	-------------------

23. Amend Section 6.4.1 County Holo Holo 2020 Initiatives (page 124 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting bullet #8 as follows:

"[Papaya Disinfestation Facility]"

24. If any provision that is amended is also found elsewhere, such language is hereby amended to provide consistency.

25. If more than one amendment to a same section is adopted on this date, all such amendments shall take effect to the extent there is no conflict. If there is a conflict, the latest amendment shall be controlling.

(Material to be deleted is bracketed. New material to be added is underscored.)
V:\AMENDMENTS\2015\03-04-2015 Bill No. 2571 GH CNT_mn.docx

(March 4, 2015)

FLOOR AMENDMENT

Relating to Amendments to the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) Booklet as referenced in Bill No. 2571, Establishing Procedures, Development Plans, and Future Growth Areas for the Līhu'e Planning District

Introduced by: Gary L. Hooser (By Request)

1. Amend Executive Summary (page 12, of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the Community Specific Policy for Hanamā'ulu as follows:

"HANAMĀ'ULU

- Intensify commercial development along Kūhiō Highway [o] to serve the needs of the Hanamā'ulu community and reduce driving distance to basic amenities.
- Create a new walkable mixed use center that interfaces with the planned Kohea Loa development and accommodates up to 500 additional housing units."

2. Amend Section 1.6 District Boundary (page 26, of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the first paragraph as follows:

"This Līhu'e Community Plan update selected the same boundaries as the last Līhu'e Development Plan, which coincides with the Līhu'e Judicial District. The Līhu'e District stretches from the northern bank of the Wailua River, [in the north] to [and including] the Pacific Ocean to the East, to Kīpū and Kīpū Kai in the [west;] South East, Haupū Mountain Range to the South; Mount Wai'ale'ale mauka to the [ocean] west (Figure 1-3)."

3. Amend Section 3.13.4 Solid Waste (page 70 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), as follows:

"The existing Kekaha Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF) [is] was projected to reach capacity in 2014. The County of Kaua'i Department of Public Works Solid Waste Division is proposing a vertical expansion [to prolong the life of the facility and provide for continued safe disposal of municipal solid waste.] and the addition of a lateral cell 2 at the existing MSWLF. This will provide for continued safe disposal of municipal solid waste until 2021. Studies and design concepts for a new landfill site and a possible resources recovery park above Hanamā'ulu are in preparation."

4. Amend Section 3.13.5 Schools (page 70 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by adding a new school type and school name following Elementary Schools as follows:

"Public Charter School

Kawaikini New Century Public Charter School (183 students)"

5. Amend Table 3-3 Neighborhood and Beach Parks in Līhu‘e District (page 73 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the description of “Līhu‘e County Park” as follows:

[Līhu‘e County Park] <u>Līhu‘e Park</u>	Town Core	[Neighborhood] <u>District</u>	3.28	Umi St.
--	-----------	-----------------------------------	------	---------

6. Amend Subsection Subcomponents (pages 82-85 and pages 116-117 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the period following each Subsection Subcomponent number as follows:

4.2.1.1[.] Līhu‘e-Hanamā‘ulu Master Plan
 4.2.1.2[.] Wailani & Ahukini Makai
 4.2.1.3[.] Kohea Loa
 4.2.1.4[.] Puakea and Wai‘ola
 4.2.1.5[.] Rice Camp
 4.2.1.6[.] Kalepa Homesteads
 4.2.3.1[.] Civic Center Site Improvements Master Plan
 4.2.3.2[.] Līhu‘e Town Core Urban Design Plan
 6.2.4.1[.] Requirements for Development in Mixed Use Special Planning Areas
 6.2.4.2[.] Demonstrating Consistency with the Līhu‘e Community Plan
 6.2.4.3[.] Requirements for Development in Mixed Use Special Planning Areas
 6.2.4.4[.] Concurrency with Infrastructure Development

7. Amend Section 4.2.1.5. Rice Camp (page 83 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), as follows:

“The County [Housing Department] recently opened Phase I of [is developing] Rice Camp as a rental project designed for elderly residents. It [will be] is located on 5.2 acres on Ho‘ala Street and [will] includes 60 one- and two-bedroom rental apartments. The units are arranged in one and two story buildings, with an emphasis on walking opportunities within the project and to the retail/commercial establishments on Rice Street. [When the first 60 units are completed, there will still be available vacant acreage in the property to allow for additional units to be constructed.] Phase II of the project is expected to provide 24-48 additional housing units to Rice Camp.”

8. Amend Section 4.2.3.1. Civic Center Site Improvements Master Plan (page 85 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the last paragraph as follows:

“The improvements proposed in the Civic Center Master Plan, which are depicted in Figure 4-3[.], are currently being revised to reflect new priorities and funding opportunities. Eiwa Street is now envisioned as a transit hub with pedestrian connections to increase safety. Surface parking will be reconfigured to accommodate parking on street.”

9. Amend Section 5.1.5, Agricultural Lands (page 98 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting main bullet #3 as follows:

“[● Establish a minimum goal for the Designation of IAL in the Līhu‘e District.]”

10. Amend Section 5.1.5 Agricultural Lands (page 98 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting main bullet #6 as follows:

“[• Explore the creation of a food hub in the Līhu'e District with community involvement.]”

11. Amend Table 5-1 Kaua'i Multimodal Land Transportation Plan Programs: Key Elements for Līhu'e (page 101 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the last element under the heading “Transit Planning,” as follows:

“[Initiate New Local Circulators (shuttles)
• Develop performance criteria for routes
• Implement new local transit shuttles]”

12. Amend Figure 5-5 Future Roadways and Parking in the Līhu'e District (page 103 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by moving the inset map to the side to allow a better view of the main map.

13. Amend Figure 5-5 Future Roadways and Parking in the Līhu'e District (page 103 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the reference to the Proposed Parking Structure as follows:

“[P Proposed Parking Structure]”

14. Amend Section 5.6 Housing (page 107 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the second paragraph as follows:

“The County adopted a [new Chapter of the] Workforce Housing Policy for the County of Kaua'i (Ordinance 860) in [2014] 2008 [specifically to address workforce housing]. The ordinance includes workforce housing requirements for residential and resort developments, and codifies procedures used to administer housing development programs. Requirements applicable to residential and resort developments are shown in the text box.”

15. Amend Section 5.6 Housing (page 107 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the title in the yellow text box as follows:

“WORKFORCE' HOUSING ORDINANCE (ORDINANCE [864] 860)
REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND RESORT
DEVELOPMENT”

16. Amend Section 5.7 Economic Development (page 108 of the Līhu'e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the 3rd bullet under “Policies” as follows:

- “Identify County resources, programs, and incentives to support and enhance Kaua'i's key economic clusters and potential growth areas, including commercial kitchen and business incubators, a [digital] creative technology center, an arts center, and tax incentives for entrepreneurs and small businesses.”

17. Amend Section 5.7 (page 108 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by amending the 6th bullet under “Policies” as follows:

- “Enhance and upgrade agricultural infrastructure in the Līhu‘e District, including irrigation, and meat and dairy processing [, and the Kaua‘i Tropical Fruit Disinfestation facility].”

18. Amend Tables 6-4 through 6-13 (pages 118-124 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting the word “Projects” in the table headings as follows:

“Table 6-4 Recommended BUILDING AND FACILITY CIP [Projects] for the Līhu‘e District”

“Table 6-5 Recommended CIP TRANSIT [Projects]”

“Table 6-6 Recommended PARKING and Access CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-7 Recommended COMPLETE STREETS CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-8 Recommended BICYCLE FACILITIES CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-9 Recommended PEDESTRIAN CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-10 Recommended ROADWAY CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-11 Recommended COUNTY OWNED UTILITY CIP [Projects]”

“Table 6-12 Recommended PARKS AND RECREATION CIP [Projects]”

19. Amend Table 6-6 Recommended PARKING and Access CIP Projects (page 119 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting PA-1 and PA-2 (and renumbering PA-3 and PA-3 accordingly) as follows:

“[PA-1	Līhu‘e Park and Convention Center Parking Structure (Part of Līhu‘e Civic Center Site Improvement Project)	\$3,050,000	Public Works – Building Division	County Six-year CIP Program: Līhu‘e Civic Center Site Improve-ments. Bond (\$3.05M) Phasing: See Below**]”
“[PA-2	Civic Center Parking Structure (Part of Līhu‘e Civic Center Site) Improvement Project	\$3,050,000	Public Works – Building Division	County Six-year CIP Program: Līhu‘e Civic Center Site Improve-ments. Bond (\$3.05M) Phasing: See Below**]”

20. Amend Table 6-13 Recommended ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CIP Projects, (page 124 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting ECD-7 (and renumber ECD-8 thru ECD-20 accordingly) as follows:

“[ECD-7	Renovations to Kaua'i Tropical Fruit Disinfestation Facility	\$1,000,000	Agriculture Development Corp.]”
---------	--	-------------	---------------------------------

21. Amend Table 6-13 Recommended ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CIP Projects (page 124 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting ECD-11 (and renumbering ECD-12 thru ECD-20 accordingly) as follows:

“[ECD-11	Wilcox Hospital improvements to develop 200-stall parking structure, expand solar farm, and install CT Scanner		Wilcox Hospital]”
----------	--	--	-------------------

22. Amend Section 6.4.1 County Holo Holo 2020 Initiatives (page 124 of the Līhu‘e Community Plan (2014) booklet), by deleting bullet #8 as follows:

“[Papaya Disinfestation Facility]”

23. If any provision that is amended is also found elsewhere, such language is hereby amended to provide consistency.

24. If more than one amendment to a same section is adopted on this date, all such amendments shall take effect to the extent there is no conflict. If there is a conflict, the latest amendment shall be controlling.

(Material to be deleted is bracketed. New material to be added is underscored.)
V:\AMENDMENTS\2015\03-04-2015 Bill No. 2571 GH CNT_mn.docx